School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1352498

Rev. Joseph Cook's Monday Lectures. FOURTH SERIES

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

James G. Wallon

(no marks)

15
C64

BOSTON MONDAY LECTURES, U.S.

MONDAY LECTURES

IN

TREMONT HALL, BOSTON, U.S.

By REV. JOSEPH COOK.

FOURTH SERIES.

By Permission of the Author.

London:
R. D. DICKINSON, FARRINGDON STREET, E.C.
1879.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

LONDON :
PRINTED BY SMYTH & YERWORTH, HOLBORN BUILDINGS,
HOLBORN, E.C.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

THE INFIDEL ATTACK ON PROPERTY 1
Prelude: The Election.

SECRET SOCIALISTIC SOCIETIES 14
Prelude: The Regeneration of Asia.

RICH AND POOR IN FACTORY TOWNS 27
Prelude: The Free Religionists and Obscene Literature.

MRS. BROWNING'S CRY OF THE CHILDREN 42
Prelude: Education and Training of Children.

SEX IN INDUSTRY 57
Prelude: Canada and its Prospects.

WAGES AND CHILDREN'S RIGHTS 69
Prelude: Temperance.

INFIDEL ATTACK ON THE FAMILY 81
Prelude: John Ruskin.

NATURAL AND STARVATION WAGES 99
Prelude: Mormonism.

IS JUSTICE A PERIL TO CAPITALISTS? 115
Prelude: Resumption of Specie payments.

ARE TRADES UNIONS A NURSERY OF SOCIALISM? . . 130
Prelude: The Evangelization of the World.

SOCIALISM AND UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE 140
Prelude: Infidelity and Infamous Literature.

SOCIALISM A POLITICAL BLUNDER 154
Prelude: Commercial Honour.

PAGE.

SELF-HELP THE HOPE OF THE POOR 167
Prelude: Fragmentary College Culture.

CO-OPERATION THE HELP OF THE POOR 181
Prelude: The Chinese Question.

CO-OPERATIVE SAVINGS BANKS AS A HELP TO THE POOR . 193
Prelude: The Sale of Women in Alaska.

DEATH-TRAPS AND FEVER-DENS IN CITY SLUMS . . . 206
Prelude: The Custom-House Changes.

COMMON SCHOOLS, HIGH SCHOOLS, AND THE POOR . . 222
Prelude: The Bible in Public Schools.

TRAMPS, SUNDAY LAWS, AND THE POOR 237
Prelude: The Chinese Question.

ALCOHOL AND THE HUMAN BRAIN 251
Prelude: Science in the International Sabbath-School Lessons.

SOCIALISM, TEMPERANCE, AND WOMAN'S VOTE . . . 266
Prelude: Romanism and High Schools.

REV. JOSEPH COOK'S LECTURES.

THE INFIDEL ATTACK ON PROPERTY.

Prelude.—The Election.

The first skirmish in the Presidential contest of 1880 will be fought in Massachusetts to-morrow. An attempt is making to use the chair of Governor Andrew as a block to aid a political adventurer into the saddle of the wild horse of inflation. The signs of the times are such that frankness is a public duty on the part of the platform, and I think also on that of the pulpit. Massachusetts is to give her opinion before another sun goes down concerning the hard-money political party and a cheap-jack and burglar, greenback and greenhorn gang.

Sitting Bull, travelling under an assumed name in Massachusetts, appears in Faneuil Hall in his shirt-sleeves, and preaches a crusade of the poor against the rich. Massachusetts weighs him and finds him first indecent, then blasphemous, then shallow, and, last and chief of all, bloodthirsty. "Let Fall River remember that Moscow was burned to ashes." "Labour must be crowned king, even if it wades knee-deep in blood." "We stand ready on election day to take the life of any man, be he United States supervisor or other officer, who attempts to debar voters from exercising the right of suffrage." "We, the working men, are in the majority, and shall install our candidate though the streets run with blood." Language worse than this I myself heard uttered to a throng of puffing, smoking loafers on a hill on the Common yonder, and, turning to watch the throng, I found in their faces a good deal of foreign blood. Undoubtedly there were men there who thought the whole affair a huge joke; but the question is, whether we can allow, in view of what is to come in Massachusetts, sentiments of this kind to be scattered broadcast through the operative population.

Eastern Massachusetts is a factory. It is a school also I know; but the factory is not conscious that the sunrise side of this Commonwealth is a school, nor is the school conscious of the fact that the same side is also a factory. Draw a line north and south, and another east and west, each dividing the population of Massachusetts in halves, and the two lines cross each other not far from Mount Auburn. Fall River, Lowell, Lawrence, this city, as manufacturing centres, have grown so fast that, in spite of the great increase of the population in the western part of the state, the population of Massachusetts balances about a point not five miles west of the State House. This growth of the manufacturing population has made New England not a New Ireland, indeed, but the commencement of one. In certain portions of the operative population a hearing can be had for the devouring absurdities of sand-lot oratory, which would have no importance were there not powder near the sparks. The powder is so wet now that there will be no explosion; but I am not sure it always will be. Only the impotence of these incendiary speeches prevents their author from being arrested. While we notice that the speeches are brainless and blasphemous and bloodthirsty, let us remember that

they are made in the interest and under the general approval of an aspirant not only for the highest political position in this state, but also for the highest in the nation. I am here as the representative of no political party, nor of any church; but I am by no means venturing too much in saying that no man ought to vote to put into public office a candidate who indirectly justifies incendiary appeals of the sort I have described, to the prejudice of the poor against the rich. What if these appeals are but the tail of a kite? Their rustling is heard at the distance. Having lately looked on Massachusetts from Washington, from Toronto, and from the Mississippi Valley; having found only too much power in such ruffian vituperation on the Mississippi, and having heard a little more closely at hand than we can here what sand-lot oratory has done on the Pacific coast, I am not willing that the fact should be overlooked that our state is an operative quarter, and that these appeals, if allowed to go unrebuked by the Church, if allowed to go unrebuked at the ballot-box, must ultimately work mischief with the half-educated operative population, largely of foreign origin. I am not speaking of the skilled operatives, over whom, as a class, a political quack has little power. It is our fault that any part of the manufacturing population is half-educated; it is our fault that any portion of it have complaints to make of employers; it is our fault that occasionally the faces of low-paid labourers have been ground by capital; it is our fault that there is not a good understanding between labour and capital all up and down the Atlantic coast. But let us not add to our faults by allowing these speeches, fit for a wild communist in Paris, to go utterly unrebuked. They are not as unimportant as you think, in view of the time to come.

While I would have the factory population of 1980 in our minds, I would have the presidential contest of 1880 there also. Especially am I anxious that working men should remember the financial distress of 1873.

Were I a manual labourer and about to vote to-morrow, I should call my family together, and say: "How much did the price of our necessaries of life rise between 1860 and 1872?" If the reply were a correct one, it would be: "Sixty-one per cent.!" "How much did our wages rise?" "Thirty per cent.!" Less than half as much. Statistics gathered by the Massachusetts Labour Bureau and by the officers who took the last national census show that the war currency lifted prices 61 per cent., and wages, on the average, 30 per cent. "Fiat money, greenback issues," I should say to my family, "made currency plenty, and prices went up and business was lively; but our wages did not go up as fast as the prices. Will it help us much to go through that experience again? We want fiat money once more. We want a greenback currency. We want to raise prices. But if the prices go up faster than our wages, how are we to be helped by the change? How are we to avoid loss by it and hardship? It is the notorious history of all inflation that wages are the last things to rise; and when they do start upward they never reach so high a plane as the necessaries of life. When the fall comes, wages go down quicker than prices of food." Therefore, I should say to my family: "I purpose to vote for 'hard money.'" Out of pity for the working men, let us stand by the honest dollar.

The French Communist has learned that inflation is no friend of his interests. The French nation contracted its currency sharply, and last January resumed specie payments. I suppose that the heresies of those who defend fiat money would obtain very little hearing on the Seine. It is a fact also, however often you may have been assured of the opposite, that the Bank of England has not suspended once since the resumption of specie payment after the wars with Napoleon. It has suspended, occasionally, the bank act by which it was determined that a certain number of issues should go out on the basis of a certain amount of reserves; but

never has there been a time since 1823 when the Bank of England would not pay a pound in gold for a pound in its promissory notes.

The American people are close upon the great blessing of resumption. We are so unthoughtful, so unmindful of what our commercial prosperity has done for us, that some of us forget the firm land which our feet almost touch, on which, indeed, they are planted, although the feet are slightly under water. We forget all that prosperity which is just before us, and wish to turn our faces again to the bottomless sea.

What has caused hard times in this country? It is said to be very difficult to answer that question. My reply to it is that the present hard times were caused by the destruction of property in the war and the abuse of credit. There were nine hundred millions of property struck out of existence by our civil contest. Suppose that there are ten millionaires in the State of Massachusetts. Let them fail, and, of course, distress would fall upon many working men. We have thirty-eight states. Let ten millionaires fail in every state. We should then have only three hundred and eighty millions swept out of existence. But what a revulsion that would make in commerce! Nevertheless, we had more than twice that amount of money sunk by our civil contest, and we borrowed money to fill up the gap. The Government went into the business of war. This obliged it to go into the business of borrowing. The Government was, as it were, a great factory, taking operatives from all quarters of the nation; and while the war continued and while our credit was good, of course times were lively. Speculators rashly abused credit, and nearly all men seemed to forget that a pay-day must come. I will not say that the Government abused credit; for we put a limit to it. We positively promised we would issue only a certain number of greenbacks. Pay-day has come at last; and, of course, the hard times have appeared in our history. In spite of our burdens, however, we have lifted ourselves so that the resumption is possible in the United States at the opening of 1879. A political party rises and proposes to prevent resumption. It proposes that we should curse ourselves with a political currency. It proposes to make prices high by allowing the currency to depreciate. It proposes, in short, to repeat the disasters a fluctuating currency has already brought upon us.

Let a fiat currency be scattered over the land, let it depreciate, and millions of dollars in value will be taken away from the deposits in the savings banks. The widows and orphans sleeping in attics; families living in cellars, that have somewhat laid away for a rainy day; and worse than all that, the relatives of those men whose graves I paced over on the battlefield of Gettysburg last Sunday; the maimed men who came from that field and others like it; the pensioners of the United States, who receive now thirty millions annually of the public money, will find this income depreciated in value millions of dollars.

Our honour and political peace and industrial prosperity are more largely at stake than we think. Vote with 1880 and with 1980 in mind. Remember 1873. So large is the unskilled operative population in Massachusetts on the Atlantic slope, and so have they been misled, that I shall not be surprised if there is a large vote for monstrous absurdities in politics. But if there is a victorious vote, if there shall be settled upon us the disgrace of appearing to justify these incendiary speeches and these insane doctrines of finance, the Massachusetts paper kite and its California appendages wound about our neck will be large enough to make a fool's cap for a state that is not accustomed to wear that style of a helmet. We must take care of the poor, or they will take care of us. We must take care of demagogues, or they will take care of both the poor and the rich.

The Lecture.

When a Bishop of Paris, in 1871, was brought before Raoul Rigault, one of the boldest of the communists, the venerable ecclesiastic, addressing his accusers, said: "Children, what do you wish to do with me?" "We are your betters," said Rigault, who was hardly thirty years of age. "Speak as if to your superiors. Who are you?" The bishop, whose charities had been known in Paris for a generation, replied: "I am the servant of God." "Where does he live?" asked Rigault. "Everywhere," was the answer. "Very well," said the Communist, "send this bishop to prison and issue an order for the arrest of one God, who lives everywhere." That order was never executed; but until God can be arrested Communism cannot succeed. A few days later Rigault lay on one of the streets of Paris: half his skull shot away; one eye a clot of blood; and the other, open, was glaring wildly into space, as if he saw the Being who cannot be arrested.

It is of little moment whether Germany, France, England or America oppose Communism or not. The important question is whether the Supreme Powers are Communists, and whether they can be arrested?

We shall best ascertain what the reply to that question is by asking for a definition of Communism and Socialism.

1. Communism, as defined by the official language of the International Society, means the abolition of the family, the abolition of nationalities, the abolition of religion, the abolition of property.

2. Socialism means all these five things except the last.

The socialist would allow the existence of individual property. He does not proclaim, with Proudhon, and with all Communism of the thoroughgoing type, that "property is robbery." But he does not believe in inheritance. He holds that a man should be allowed to have only as much property as he can personally use. The extreme socialist of the French, German, and Russian type agrees with the Communist in clamouring for the abolition of inheritance, nationality, family, and religion. "The International Society proclaims itself atheist." This is its own language. A procession of socialists, singing ribald songs, passed lately into a cemetery in Berlin through gates on which the words "There is no hereafter" were inscribed. Over the open grave orations were pronounced, asserting that there is no immortality.

At the bottom of Socialism there is disbelief in the family. And, although the family is not in the chronological order the first point

of attack, it is in the logical order; for when once the family is destroyed as a social institution there will be less reason for maintaining the laws of inheritance or, indeed, any of our present regulations concerning property. I am not asserting that all socialists understand by socialism these four things, or that all communists would accept my definition; but the ringleaders, the positive men, in both socialistic and communistic circles hold these notions. I am not accusing trades unions of holding them, although the foremost of American newspapers has endeavoured to prove that American trades unions are in far too close alliance with secret socialistic organizations. Many well-meaning people are supporting positions more or less socialistic, and abhor the extremes of socialism, strictly so-called But the central force of any great movement in public sentiment usually draws into its current, first or last, the subsidiary ripples. In practical conflict on the field of politics all great causes generalize themselves and minor details drop out of view. The question between North and South in our civil war was that between freedom and slavery, with details omitted. The broad issue between communism and socialism, on the one hand, and the Christian commonwealth, on the other, is the contrast between an atheistic and a theistic arrangement of society. The modern socialistic question is whether God shall be or shall not be arrested; or, rather, whether the order shall be given for His arrest or not. Are the Supreme Powers in favour of the abolition of the family? Are they in favour of the abolition of the laws of inheritance? Are they in favour of such a reorganization of society as would require the uprooting of several of the deepest instincts in human nature? Surely the love of home and the love of property are two of the deepest instincts in man. The question is whether the Supreme Powers are levellers up or levellers down? I hope they are the former, and that the progress of the ages will show that their plan in this respect must come to fruition. But the plan of socialism, the plan of communism, is levelling down. The distinction between white republicanism and red republicanism, between American constitutional republicanism and Parisian communistic democracy, is that the one levels up and the other levels down. If I am not mistaken, the Supreme Powers are on the side of the levellers up, and exceedingly against the levellers down.

It is a common impression that American society is incapable of being infected to any large degree by the wild socialistic notions produced chiefly by the political evils of the Old World. We have a largely unoccupied and a monumentally free country. We have no law of primogeniture, no aristocracy, and no privileged classes. There

never can arise in America, some of us think, any great danger from either communistic or socialistic notions. In view of this position of public sentiment, I beg leave to raise for serious discussion the question "How large is the susceptibility of America to communistic and socialistic political disease?"

1. The United States are soon to be the wealthiest of all nations.

2. In proportion to the wealth of a nation, on the whole, has heretofore been the inequality of its citizens as to wealth.

3. It appears to be inevitable, therefore, that, as the richest of all nations, the United States will exhibit large inequalities of wealth among their citizens.

4. In Christendom, as a whole, the inequality of men as to wealth, although slavery has been abolished, is greater now than it was 400 or 100 years ago.

5. This is largely the result of the massing of both labour and capital, on account of the growth of all means of intercommunication and the consequent disproportionate increase of the size of city populations. The massing of capital strengthens it. The massing of labour weakens it.

6. Universal suffrage in the United States is sure to carry questions between capital and labour into politics.

7. It is at present estimated that 1,500,000 voters belong to secret labour organizations in the United States.

8. It is their avowed purpose to acquire political power, and to govern the country in such a way as to cripple capital and promote the interests of manual labourers.

9. Demagogues, therefore, are likely to make use of this issue to lift themselves into power, and have already commenced their work on a large scale.

10. No hereditary aristocracy in America and no king is likely to appear here to keep order.

11. The United States are the only nation in which questions between capital and labour cannot be settled by force, and must be settled by reason.

12. The safety of republican institutions in the United States depends on the prevention of the formation of four classes here: an indigent class, an unemployed class, an ignorant class, an unprincipled class.

13. The only effectual means of preventing the formation of the first three of these classes is to prevent the formation of the fourth.

14. The keynote of safety for society is not democratic, but theocratic equality.

The commercial greatness of England commonly dazzles politicians

and men of affairs. Her foremost statesman has lately printed the opinion that, in the race of commercial prosperity, the United States are passing Great Britain by with swiftness and ease. Mr. Gladstone thinks that the census of 1880 will show that the United States is undoubtedly the wealthiest of all nations. The income of the United Kingdom is now a thousand million pounds annually. This enormous fortune has been accumulated so rapidly that, if Great Britain had started from nothing fifty years ago and progressed at the rate of the recent annual increment of her wealth, she would have now not far from her present income. "While we have been advancing with this portentous rapidity," says Mr. Gladstone, "America is passing us by in a canter." * Mr. Gladstone ventures to proclaim to England that America can, and probably will, wrest from Great Britain the far-stretched, glittering, massive sceptre of her commercial supremacy. "We have no title," says Mr. Gladstone. "I have no inclination to murmur at the prospect. If America acquires commercial supremacy, she will make the acquisition by the right of the strongest; but in this instance the strongest means the best. She will probably become what we are now, the head servant in the great household of the world, the employer of all employed, because her service will be the most and ablest. We have no more title against her than Venice, or Genoa, or Holland has had against us. There can hardly be a doubt, as between the America and England of the future, that the daughter, at some no very distant time, will, whether fairer or less fair, be unquestionably yet stronger than the mother." "*O matre forti filia fortior.*" †

Thus, weighing all his syllables, speaks the foremost statesman of a power of which our Webster used to like to say that her morning drum-beat, following the sun and keeping company with the hours, encircles the world with one continuous strain of the martial airs of England.

Pardon me, gentlemen, if I ask you not to underrate America commercially. At your leisure, in your libraries, will you cover the United States on the map (illustrating on Guyot's wall atlas hung on the platform), and then take up the covering object and place it on the Roman Empire. Cæsar's dominion will be more than hidden. Open your compasses until you touch on the one side Boston and on the other San Francisco, and you have separated them so widely that they cannot be put down anywhere within the bounds of Cæsar's domain. The longest line that can be drawn inside the old Roman

---

* *North American Review*, September and October, 1878, p. 181.
† *Ibid.*, pp. 180, 181.

Empire will not reach from Boston to San Francisco. The Roman eagles, when their wings were strongest, never flew as far as from Plymouth Rock to the Golden Gate. The Roman Empire lay on the shoulder of the planet, in shape like a boy's fish-reel, its four corners, London in England, Thebes in Egypt, the Straits of Gibraltar, and the frosty Caucasus. Open your compasses until you touch on the one side London and on the other side Thebes, and you have not separated them as far as you must to span the green fields and steepled cities between the surf of the Bay of Fundy and the waterfalls of the Yosemite. Open them again, until they touch Gibraltar on the one hand and the Caucasian range on the other, and you have not opened them widely enough to touch on the one hand the Florida reefs, and on the other the

> ——— "continuous woods
> Where rolls the Oregon. and hears no sound
> Save his own dashings."

Allow me to pluck up the territory of the American Union, as Milton's angels did the hills of Heaven, and will you employ the mass as a pattern and cut from some other portion of the globe another piece like it? I place one corner of it upon London and the other corner projects beyond Thebes in Egypt. I place a corner on the Caucasian range, and another corner juts into the Atlantic Ocean beyond Gibraltar. This stretch of territory in the United States is all or nearly all good land, while the interior of the Roman Empire was composed of the sterile plain of the Mediterranean. Where else can you cut out of the globe a continuous empire equal to that which the United States occupy? Bigness is not greatness. I hope I am not of such a cheap mood as to think that because we are to be the wealthiest we are to be the happiest of all nations. Physical size, however, is opportunity, and opportunity occupied is greatness. A territory equal in size to ours (illustrating on the map) might be cut out of the tawny shoulders of Africa; but it would be principally composed of blistering sands. You might cut it out of the mighty shoulders of Russia; but it would be nearly all a stretch of sluggish streams, locked in ice six months of the year, and fringed with stunted willows and birches. You might cut it out of Western and Central Asia; but a great portion of it would consist of the nearly rainless regions of Arabia and Persia. Endeavour to cut it from Southern Asia, and the Himalayas and the sterile stretches of Thibet are in the way. Cut it from the Chinese side of Asia, and the northern portion of it would reach into the desolate Arctic plain. I thus show you by ocular demonstration that there is no place on the earth from which you could cut a continuous territory equal to that of the United States,

unless it be in South America itself. There is a tract of fertile land so large that when we add it to the tract in North America we have no hesitation in agreeing with scholars that the larger number of the arable acres of the planet are on the American side of the globe.

Mr. Gladstone says that "the distinction between continuous empire and empire severed and dispersed over sea is vital." * The American Union has a territory fitted to be the base of the largest continuous empire ever established by man. For geographical reasons, we cannot well avoid commercial pre-eminence in the world. I am proud of America because of her physical capacity. I am afraid of America for the same reason. And yet, for political and geographical reasons, taken together, I had rather be an American than a Romar under Cæsar or a Briton under Victoria.

Compared with the Hayeses and Tildens of our future, and the prizes at their disposal, Cæsar, Antony, and Lepidus were schoolboys playing with marbles. The most powerful inspirations to patriotism arise from the great scale of America, and from the same source will arise also gigantic temptations to greed and fraud. It is none too early for us to fasten attention upon the fact that the wealthiest of all nations will give enormous opportunity to capital. American society will, no doubt, exhibit great inequalites; not so much between classes as between conditions in life. We have no classes. Democratic society is so arranged that the poor man can rise, if he have ability. The cripples and the roughs sink to a low but by no means to a politically powerless position in American society. There will be an unprincipled class at the bottom of our great cities, because a man who has principle and energy can rise. Instead of having a lower class filled with a certain traditional pride in its own position; instead of having a peasantry that may possess great virtues, we are likely to have a lower class made up of roughs, sneaks, and cripples. Gulls go to the bottom in free society. That is very unpopular doctrine; but it is high time to proclaim it. In the future contests between capital and labour in this country I anticipate a fierceness and absurdity at times in the demands of labour that are rarely found even in the Old World. I anticipate also a high, daring unscrupulousness at times on the part of the fifth-rate business managers, such as is rarely met with in the Old World, for nowhere on the globe will the arms of capital reach around such enormous enterprises as here.

All this, you say, is the language of an alarmist. Will you re-

* *North American Review*, September and October, 1878, p. 180, 181.

member the Pittsburgh riots, and what might have happened if they had been a little more extensive? It has been my fortune to move across the country somewhat since I had the honour to stand here last, and I am impressed with great respect for those who say that the railway intercommunication of this nation might be put at the mercy of strikers, communist and secret socialistic organizations, were they only supported by political sentiment enough to impede for any considerable time the action of the repressing arm of the executive in the state and nation.

America has a railway arm and a water arm. Stretching from the Pacific, as from a shoulder, the railway arm ends in a hand which clasps the Atlantic coast. One finger runs to Baltimore, and you call it the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad; another to Philadelphia, and you call it the Pennsylvania Central; another to New York, and you call it the Erie; another to Boston, and you call it the New York Central; another plunges north of the Great Lakes and drops down to Portland, and you call it the Grand Trunk. These gigantic fingers unite in a palm covering Ohio and Indiana, and behind the palm the railways unite in a wristlet at Chicago. This is the most important railway centre on the globe, and is likely to be so for many years to come. The water arm is the Mississippi, stretching northward from the Gulf, as from a shoulder, and opening its palm upon the upper part of its valley. St. Louis is the water wristlet upon that arm. Folded across the breast of our beloved America, these arms are full of health: but what if the absurdities of socialism, what if strikes, what if the discontent of labour and of an unemployed and indigent and ignorant population in cities were to settle as poison in the joints of these wristlets in a more thickly populated land, who does not see that a million five hundred thousand voters in secret political organizations might paralyze the executive arm of the state in which a strike or riot should occur, and so might give us trouble for more than three days and an hour? This vast chain of intercommunication between the West and the East, if broken at one link, is broken everywhere for the time. These railways stretch out to millions of working men who live in the joints; and when one little joint at Pittsburgh was attacked with disease the whole arm felt the pain. The shoulder felt it; the finger-tips felt it. You drove the disease out of the finger-tips; but it seized on many a joint. Several of the knuckles had poison in them. The wrist was only kept free of disease by a pretty severe application of the pressure of military force. It was my fortune to be in Chicago at the time when soldiers were expected from the Indian reservations, and when a general, the moment he reached the railway station in that Western city, was

seized and put upon the shoulders of the glad citizens and carried away to his post of duty in triumph. Mobs were put down by musketry in several parts of Chicago. If that city did not tremble during the days of the Pittsburgh riots, it was certainly ill at ease. Well, now, give me a million or two of voters in secret organizations and in sympathy with strikes; give me a few desperate demagogues, calculating all the chances of politics and ruling a quarter of our press; give me an average population of two hundred to the square mile in the United States; multiply the perishing and dangerous classes in our large cities in proportion to that increase of the size of the general population; and I undertake to say that the wealthiest nation of the globe may be neither the happiest nor the strongest.

Universal suffrage is not likely to be limited very much in our time. I would have the reading test applied. I think that would do good; but it would not free us from the power of the demagogues to lead the discontented between labour and capital into such riot as to bring at times perils upon trade. We certainly have nothing to depend upon here but public sentiment and the national will. I read in the *Atlantic Monthly* an article of high merit on certain dangerous tendencies in American life; but in the next number I find a criticism upon it, to the effect that the only way to keep the United States in order is to reduce instruction for the masses to reading, writing, and arithmetic. We never shall do that. "Preach the Gospel to every creature." That is the command obedience to which has brought into the world most of our present political difficulties, and obedience to which, if continued, will drive them out. A continent of humanity is rising from under the sea, and for a while it is a pestilential swamp; but the remedy is not to stop its rising and crush it back into chaos. The remedy is to keep lifting it, lifting it, until all its morasses are firm, sweet land.

Let us fasten our attention upon the great outlines of our means of safety. They are the prevention of the formation of an impecunious class, of an unemployed class, and of an ignorant and an unprincipled class. I hold that in a republic neither of these classes can be allowed to exist with safety to the institutions of the land.

If we are to attack the evils which lead to the formation of these four classes, we may as well strike first at the tap root—the unprincipled class, the morally uneducated class. There must cease to be an unprincipled class or there will be an ignorant class, and then an unemployed class, and then an inpecunious class, and then an explosive class, lying under the sparks of the oratory of demagogues. There is nothing attracting more attention throughout

the world to-day than the methods of preventing the formation of these four classes in Christendom, and there is nothing but Christian endeavour that ever can prevent the formation of an unprincipled class. We shall not call on writers of cipher dispatches to enter into that business.

Lord Beaconsfield stands now in the eye of the world, and when he was younger by some thirty years he wrote a book called "Tancred," in which many of the ideas he is now carrying out were expressed. You remember that he sends a young English lord from the Thames to the Jordan in search of remedies for the social and political evils of Europe. We have had a diffusion of liberty, Lord Beaconsfield says, and to some extent of intelligence and property; but the people are not happy. Here is a man whom Carlyle calls the Hebrew sorcerer, leading English lords and British interests as by some charm of superior blood; and this aristocrat, the guide of the privileged classes, makes his English lord finally kneel down in the Holy Sepulchre and at Bethany and in Bethlehem, to obtain from the Unseen Powers a response to his prayer for guidance as to the healing of the nations. He passes through the jaws of death at Petra, and at last, in the midnight of Sinai, Tancred, as you remember, goes alone to the spot where the law was delivered, kneels down there under the mysterious brightness of the Eastern stars, offers prayer in agony, falls at last into a trance, and, looking up, he beholds the genius of Christianity, with her hands spread over the continents, and the response his petition received from her was in these words, Lord Beaconsfield's own, the summit of his wisdom as a man of affairs:

"The equality of men can only be accomplished by the sovereignty of God. The longing for fraternity can never be satisfied but under the sway of a common Father. Announce the sublime and solacing doctrine of theocratic equality." *

What does this message mean? It signifies that in a just organization of society men will encourage what God encourages, and repress what God represses. It means that in a perfect organization of society the bad man is not the equal of the good man; but that whoever is loyal to God, him God and all good men shall help. In short, the idea of democratic equality and of theocratic equality conflict now in the world, and America going back to the ideas of our fathers would be going back only to the ideas of Beaconsfield; only to the ideas of De Tocqueville and Burke, who tell us that men

* "*Tancred*," Book iv. chap viii.

never so much need to be theocratic as when they are the most democratic; only to the ideas of Christianity, from its first age to the present hour. Let us lift high above all clouds of class animosity and political intrigue the great ensign bearing for its motto "Theocratic Equality." Whenever the Church does that in America she will see in the heavens above the banner a Cross appearing, and above the words: "By this Sign Conquer."

SECRET SOCIALISTIC SOCIETIES.

Prelude.—The Regeneration of Asia.

The regeneration of Asia is a colossal event yet far off, but approaching us with an assured and of late accelerated step. Great Britain is now an essentially Asiatic power. This, indeed, is the claim of the leader of the present administration in the United Kingdom; and Lord Salisbury has said that the boundaries of Turkey are in some sense the boundaries of England. It is very interesting for Americans to notice how several dazzling illusions concerning the English occupation of Cyprus and the reform of the Turkish Empire under British political pressure have been dissipated by the progress of events, and how the present attitude of sober thought appears to be represented by the cool proposition, long ago advocated by this statesman on my left [turning toward the venerable Dr. Rufus Anderson, for many years secretary of the American Board of Foreign Missions], that religious rather than political causes must be relied upon to regenerate Asia Minor. Sir, Lord Beaconsfield is the left hand of reform in Turkey; but the work you have been doing is the right hand. The left hand needs the right, and the right the left; but the left needs its brother more than the right does. God grant that the two may be clasped in sympathy—British political influence opening the way for American religious effort in Turkey, and American religious effort opening the way for those reforms which Great Britain would force upon the Sultan!

It appears to be ascertained at last by the newspapers of the United Kingdom that a majority of the Mahommedans in Turkey are not Turks, but Arabs; that many of them are mountain tribes, almost entirely beyond the control of the Sublime Porte; and that concessions wrung from the Sultan may be entirely refused by the Kurds, Yezidees, Copts and Druses, Maronites and Turcomans, Osmanlis, Persians, Gipsies, and Hindu Fakirs, which make up the motley mass of the population of Turkey in Asia. Whoever has lived long in the East will look with delight upon the pressure England is bringing to bear upon the Sultan; but not with perfect expectation of the swift success of this incitement to reform. It is understood thoroughly well in the East that the Sultan is not omnipotent; and that it is as yet impossible for him, even with the aid of England, to carry through great political changes in the face of the Koran, without inciting religious wars and setting population to massacre population.

When I look toward that portion of Asia which now draws the attention of the whole world, the most hopeful signs of progress are not, in my judgment, to be found in the British occupation of Cyprus; nor in the project of a railway from the Syrian coast to the head of the Persian Gulf, although such a road must be built before many years. The distance is only that from Boston to Chicago. My hope for Asia Minor is in a series of facts illustrating the usefulness of American teachers, physicians, and missionaries there. Indeed, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe used to say that the future of the East depended on these men; and Lord Beaconsfield himself has lately been drawing his best information from the reports of these Americans. I undertake to affirm that in the mission-houses of Boston and New

York more complete and more authentic information concerning the present condition and possible future of Turkey can be found than in the archives of the Turkish Empire itself.

The Halys and Araxes, the Cydnus, the Tigris and the Euphrates, the Orontes and the Meander yet roll on to the sea, as they did when they were the burden of classic Grecian song and the scene of imperial events in history. The pleasant lands through which Xenophon led the retreat of the Greeks, and Alexander and the Crusaders marched to their victories in the East, are dear to American sympathies. America gave to Syria the first scientific traveller, the first translation of the Bible into Arabic, the first printing press, the first modern churches, the first colleges. In 1874 Americans printed at Beirût 30,000 volumes and 9,791,910 pages in Arabic.

When Cyrus Hamlin, who in many particulars deserves to be called the father of education in Turkey in Europe, went abroad there was not a school-book in the language spoken by the people of Turkey. Now we have a long list not only of text-books on grammar, rhetoric, logic, chemistry, surveying, history, zoology, mental and moral philosophy, political economy, anatomy, physiology, and medicine; but also of the best English works on distinctively Christian truth, and these in the Armenian, the Turkish, and the Asiatic tongues. There are 11,000 pupils in Turkish common schools which owe their origin to American influences. In the high schools founded by Americans for young men and women thousands are already gathered. But the facts which strike public attention most at a distance are the steady shining of Robert College, at Constantinople, since 1862—a beacon-light on that stormy coast between Asia and Europe; the steady flame of the Syrian Protestant College, at Beirût, since 1865—as many pupils in it now as in Williams College, and as able a corps of professors; the gleaming of the Central Turkey College at Aintab, behind the hills; and the attempt to light up another torch (God bless the attempt) at Harput, on the flashing waters of the Upper Euphrates. These are American lighthouses on a dark Mohammedan coast, where a very hungry surf roars yet and the beaches have been strewn with wrecks for six hundred years.

More than one American physician has laid down his life to teach Asia Minor the healing art. When Dr. West, a graduate of Yale College, after eighteen years of faithful service as a physician in Turkey, was on his death-bed, prayers were offered for his recovery in the Armenian churches and Mohammedan mosques. He had performed some fourteen hundred operations on the eye alone, and the thousands of people of all tribes and tongues who followed his body to the grave regarded him as a national benefactor.

Newspapers little by little acquire popular power, under American guidance, in Turkey. A slight simmering caused by American fire may be heard around the whole torpid edge of the kettle of stagnant water which we call the Turkish Empire.

Polygamy begins to be questioned. Two generations ago it was an insult to a Mohammedan to ask after the health of his wife and daughters. The position of woman in Asia Minor has been so changed in the last fifty years that not infrequently now you may hear a Mohammedan polygamist saying: "My wife knows how to read." He is proud of the fact; and this is an immense advance. With the introduction of even a slight amount of intelligence there comes an opening for religious truth. The predecessor of commerce and of any large political reform in Turkey must be Christianity. You must diffuse conscientiousness and modern ideas in a measure through the Turkish clans before you can mould them like wax in the fingers of political power.

Do you say that Japan shows how a nation may be reformed by means of political instrumentalities alone? Native Japanese scholars tell us that the exterior of life has changed there; but that the essence of life remains yet largely unaltered.* An immense seething is going on in Japan. That pot boils; the scum is at the top, and will be removed in due time; but we have not yet lifted the scum from the bottom of the Turkish kettle as a whole. After all application of American and British fire, the simmering is hardly audible yet, if you listen from this side of the Atlantic.

Into this population, sunk in polygamy; into these Mohammedan quarters, where, as our Seward said, when he came back from his tour around the world, there is no home and no social life, the leading political party in England proposes to introduce the hands of British imperialism, pushed by the Beaconsfield cabinet. Turkey is yet very cold wax to manipulate. My feeling is that until religious efforts have been carried much further in Asia Minor than they have been heretofore, its manipulation by the strong political grasp of Russia and England may break the wax, indeed, but not mould it into the patterns desired by those who apply the political pressure. I do not expect from political sources the regeneration of Asia; but I do expect from these strong arms the bursting down of high walls of exclusiveness, and the opening of Asia to better than political influences. Is the power that has done most to reform Asia Minor—religious effort—ready to go forward with its enterprises there? Beaconsfield has opened the Turkish gate. Is America ready to enter?

America has entered Asia on the west side by schools and colleges. What is she to do on the eastern? Politicians of California tell us that the Chinese cannot be made Christians. The governor of California says that there are no signs that education and religious efforts are to bring the Chinese into connection with the churches in America. The same mail that brings us that intelligence from the governor brings intelligence from the men who work in the Chinese quarters that there are at this moment in California near four hundred Chinese members of American churches. There is nothing the Chinese on the Pacific Coast desire more than a knowledge of the English language; and to how much is this the key? A stately Chinese delegation at Washington is honourably received, and the Burlingame treaty is not yet annulled. When I listen in the Far West to the subterranean voices of public sentiment, I find that the politicians of the fourth and fifth rank and the hoodlums are against the Chinese; but that a very different sentiment prevails with the educated public and with the best business men of the Pacific Coast.

Great historical forces now give America an immense opportunity to make California a door to China on the east, while Beaconsfield opens the door to America in Asia on the west. The certainty is that we have an opportunity in California to give Christianity and modern education a good reputation with thousands of Chinamen who come into immediate contact with American civilization. It is probable that, before many years pass, cheap factories will be built in China, and our machines bought and set up there. I do not know what business men are thinking of when they propose to drive the Chinese out of California. There will be a demand for cheap wares in China, and we can supply the Chinese trade if we are commercially skilful; otherwise we shall be undersold by the Chinese themselves. The best of our inventions will be copied by one of the most imitative nations on the globe. We can have the carrying trade of the Pacific, if we want it. Let us secure the introduction into China of a good opinion con-

* *North American Review*, Nov. and Dec., 1878, p. 406.

cerning Christianity and education. Let us support the reform in Japan which now seems to promise to make that island the England of the Pacific. Let us deepen the moral and educational influence of America in Asia at both its eastern and western gates.

I am fortunate in speaking in presence of a leader of American effort not only in Asia Minor, but in India, in China, in Japan, and in the islands of the sea. His has been the advocacy of an Imperialism before which all the glittering fancies of a Beaconsfield pale. I confess that I have more sympathy with Beaconsfield's imperialism than with a certain narrow, insular parochial policy on the part of some of his English opponents, who would give up the colonies of Great Britain, and would allow the eastern larger half of the United Kingdom to dissolve, if it pleases. Providence, as I judge, does not intend to draw the immense arms of the British Empire back into their shell. Perhaps God means to keep in order great portions of the world, through the arms of England stretched toward the sunrise, and those of America stretched toward the sunset. I am not too bold in hoping that the time may come when English-speaking nations will keep treaties with each other; will have no war with each other without first trying arbitration as a remedy; will little by little codify their international regulations so as to have common copyrights and patent laws, and thus come slowly into a commercial alliance that will strike a universal peace through half the continents and all the seas.

The Lecture.

Let us imagine ourselves assembled in the ruins of the Tuileries, or within sound of the pistol-shots lately fired at one of the most paternal of emperors, or in sight of the flash of the weapon of Vera Sassulitch, in St. Petersburg, and of seven similar subsequent attempts thereto to take the lives of Russian officials. If these scenes are too distant to produce any deep effect upon our sensibilities, will you be good enough to assemble in sight of the flames of the railway riots at Pittsburgh, in 1877, at a time when at least ten American towns were kept in order by musketry?

When the railway riots in the United States were suppressed, in 1877, the work of the formation of secret labour organizations were taken up with vigour. It has progressed at such speed that within the last six months very interesting facts have become public concerning three or four important secret labour organizations more or less socialistic in their character. I am quite aware that I cannot speak from personal study of these veiled socialistic societies. Outside of the membership of these organizations, there are not twenty men in the United States who can describe them from actual observation; and yet, throwing a drag-net over all current publications and some secret sources of information, I have been enabled to bring together a number of facts which appear to me to be very suggestive. In order to give them the proper emphasis, I must go back, for a

moment, to the European birth of certain American communistic parties.

Here is the great philosopher, Fichte, teaching in Berlin; and he inculcates the doctrine that every man has a right to life, and therefore to the opportunity to earn a living. If a man has no opportunity to earn a living, he must steal. Fichte taught this, and that such theft is not theft, but just reprisal against society. There are certain books by Fichte, rarely read, called the "Foundation of Natural Right," and "The Closed State," and "The Reason State," and in them thoroughly revolutionary political doctrines are taught. Fichte demanded from the state the right of labour. If a man cannot live by his labour, he is not left in the enjoyment of his absolute property —that is, his life—and is thenceforth not obligated to acknowledge the property of any other man, since the contract of the state to secure everyone his own property has been violated. Such a man must be aided, lest property become insecure. At the same time, Fitche demands that the state shall tolerate no idlers.*

Ferdinand Lasalle, the first important name among the agitators in the socialistic circles of Germany, was a pupil of Fichte. He adhered throughout life to his master's philosophical, as well as to his political theories. He never became a materialist; but was an idealist and pantheist to his death, in a duel, in 1864, at the age of thirty-eight. The German socialists now render to his memory almost divine honours. It is Fichte that speaks in Lasalle.

Karl Marx, who gathered his knowledge of communism largely from French sources, abandoned the idealism and pantheism of Hegel and Fichte, adopted a coarse materialism as his creed, adjusted to it the doctrines of Häckel—that the soul is only the result of matter in motion; that there is no immortality; and that conscience points out no authoritative code of morality. "With me," says Marx, "the ideal is simply matter transformed and translated in the human head." Religion, he thinks, is opium for the people. There is nothing divine in man; there is no celestial spark in him, according to Marx. Saturated with this materialistic philosophy, he finds it very easy to adopt false doctrines concerning the family; very easy, after having abolished the family in his scheme of thought, to draw his trenches around inheritance, and so to abandon the ideas of the modern world concerning transmission of property, and plunge onward with his followers into the abyss of communism.

In Lasalle you find the eloquence of a cultivated Jew; and also in

---

* See Huber, Prof. J., article on "Social Democracy in Germany." *International Review*, November and December, 1878, p. 803.

Karl Marx, for both these men are of Jewish descent. Lasalle obtained a very extensive education in jurisprudence, in history and political economy, and was an exceedingly brilliant pamphleteer. He had many interviews with Bismarck, and once predicted publicly that the latter would play the part of Sir Robert Peel, and declare himself in favour of universal suffrage.

Lasalle's central demand was for governmental aid to labour. Here is the burgher class, he used to say to the peasants of Germany. When rich men wish to build railways, the state aids them. When you wish to found co-operative enterprises, why should not the state aid you? Universal suffrage ought to be proclaimed and the fourth class should come into power. The labouring masses should found producers' associations on the largest scale. The state should secure to the creditors of such associations the payment of the interest on their capital. Thus the government should assist labour in its penury to obtain buildings, machinery, tools, and raw material for manufactures. The producers' associations should take into the managing partnership all their hired labourers, and gradually form themselves into a credit assurance. Over-production should be prevented by the state. Lasalle thought these clumsy schemes would change the face of the world in fifty years, so that it would not be recognized as the same world. A few of his ideas, no doubt, were sound if taken out of their combination with the rest; but his political philosophy, as a whole, was ludicrously shallow. He can hardly be called a communist, however. He was a political liberal of a dangerous type.*

It is important to make a broad distinction between four styles of political sentiment concerning the distribution of property. First, co-operation, a very judicious scheme in many cases, though unsuccessful thus far in most instances where it has been tried; next, political liberalism; then, below that, socialism; and, at the bottom of all, communism. I suppose that many who call themselves socialists are only political liberalists; for socialism, strictly defined, is atheistic, and so is communism, and it is with these two lower ranges of political sentiment that I have always to do. Possibly you think that I am giving too stern accounts of the ringleaders among communists and socialists; but I undertake to say, as the scholar at my side [referring to the Rev. Dr. Thomas] is reported to have said in public yesterday, that extreme communism is so black that you cannot do it injustice. The Russian nihilist, the German extreme socialist, believes in no hereafter and in no

* See Mehring, "*Die Deutsche Socialdemokratie*," Bremen, 1878.

God. One of the most popular labour songs in Germany has this couplet:

> "*Der ist ein Lump, der eines Gottes Namen*
> *In Wort und Schrift demuthig anerkennt.*"
>
> "Only a vagabond will humbly own
> There is a God—with word and pen."

If a man is to have no future existence and no judge, he may do as he pleases, except in so far as enlightened selfishness forbids. If our only chance is here, we may as well take what we can get. Fifteen thousand socialists in a procession passed into a cemetery in Berlin, not long ago, and twenty thousand in another procession on another occasion, and buried comrades with orations asserting that there is no immortality. Berlin held her breath when that procession moved through the streets, because she feared a riot in all the slums and did not know what attack might be made on property. When the pistol-shots at the Emperor were fired, it is not a wonder she was alarmed.

What has happened in Germany? Why, on the death of Lasalle, certain German working men, Frenchmen also, and Poles and Bohemians, met at St. Martin's Hall, in London. The date was 1864. They founded the International Society, of which we have all heard, and which is to-day supposed to have two and a-half million men in its membership, or close sympathy with it, on the Continent of Europe. The headquarters of the International Society are now in New York City. It is managed from the mouth of the Hudson and the banks of the Thames. In fact, however, the headquarters in New York are only nominally supreme. Really the cottage of Karl Marx, an exile in London, is the throne of the International Society. He manages both its left and its right wings now. The right wing revolted from him at the Congress in Geneva, in 1866; but has come over to him at last. His work on "Capital," one of the most thorough-going defences of materialism in philosophy and socialism in political economy, is the New Testament of the International Society. As Marx proclaims himself atheist, so does this immense organization.

The International Society has been accused of bringing on the riots in Paris when the Tuileries were burned. It has been accused of having a plan to raise riot in the principal cities of Europe at the time Paris was attacked by the communistic mob. I have tried to ascertain how much truth there is in these charges. In a minute investigation of the history of the International Society, perhaps the most significant document on which I have been able to put my hands is a letter from Karl Marx, written to the communists of Paris

just before their rising. Marx said to the communists, in April, 1871: "We are as yet but three millions at most. In twenty years we shall be fifty, a hundred millions, perhaps. Then the world will belong to us, for it will not be only Paris, Lyons, and Marseilles which will rise against odious capital; but Berlin, Munich, and Dresden, Vienna, London, Liverpool, Manchester, Brussels, St. Petersburg, New York—in short, the whole world. And before this new insurrection, such as history has not yet known, the past will disappear like a hideous nightmare, for the popular conflagration, kindled at a hundred points at once, like an immense dawn, will destroy even its memory."

Address language of that sort to the petroleum communists who burned the Tuileries; address it to men made lawless by carelessness of their interests on the part of despotic governments; address it to men who have been taught that there is no hereafter, and that God is only necessity, ruling through the laws of matter; address that language to millions banded in secret organizations all over the world, and you find that it means as much mischief everywhere as occurred at Paris on a small area, if that mischief is necessary to the success of the desired revolution. I do not credit the International Society with the shedding of all the blood that was poured out at Paris; but the secret history of 1871 in Europe proves that, if this organization had been strong enough to have raised riot in other large cities, as they did in Paris, they would have done so, and that what was lacking was power, and not the will. Karl Marx is credited with saying now that in the United States, and in Great Britain, and perhaps in France, a reform of labour will occur without bloody revolution; but that blood must be shed in Germany, and in Russia, and in Italy, and in Austria.

Whatever the real or purposed crimes of the Internationals, the certainty is that the Paris Commune frightened Germany. She was alarmed yet more by the power of the socialistic party at the polls. In the German elections of 1871 the socialists as a political party polled 140,000 votes; in 1874, 350,900; in 1877, 550,000. In 1878 Bismarck took this jumping-jack, which cannot be kept down, and crushed him back into his box, shut the lid, and turned the key.

The suppression of socialistic newspapers and public meetings in Germany will be the commencement of another crusade for the formation of secret socialistic societies there. It will be the re-invigoration of all the secret socialistic and communistic organizations in Europe. Nevertheless, I am not here to say that America, in Bismarck's place, might not have done substantially what he did.

Once make capital thoroughly afraid of socialists, tramps and roughs

in the United States, and see how swift and merciless it will be in self-defence. I undertake to tell any lawless classes at the bottom of our cities that, if they thoroughly alarm capital in this country, it will treat them with as much severity as the necessity of preserving the public peace may require. We shall keep order roughly here, if necessary; for all Americans are capitalists, or expect to be. Alarm property; let it be understood that there is real danger in Chicago and New York and St. Louis from socialistic secret organizations; let strikers and communists and demagogues grasp the throat of our great railway intercommunications, and when capital is thoroughly aroused it will not be held back here, as it has been sometimes in Europe, by a feeling that, after all, the rioters have been abused. Thiersch, in his great work on the Christian commonwealth, says that in 1830 and in 1848 in Europe many a ruler was made inefficient by a secret feeling that the working classes had not had their rights. Kings tremble on their thrones when they feel that they have no right to be kings. In America the people feel they have a right to be kings, and they will exercise their right. There will be no handwriting on the wall here for Belshazzar to look at; and, therefore, his knees will never smite together. Of course, a republic can be attacked for three days and an hour. A republic in history is like a raft on the sea. You cannot sink it; but you are apt to put your foot through it into the waves. A monarchy is like a man-of-war. Bad shots between wind and water hurt it exceedingly; there is danger of capsizing. But democracy is a raft. You cannot easily overturn it. It is a wet place; but it is a pretty safe one, and we are on it and we are to have order here, and we build up the raft under our feet until there is dry standing-room for us all.

If there should be an election in the United States showing that there is a serious danger from socialistic secret political organizations, what would happen? Why, from Plymouth Rock to the Golden Gate, we should have a propagandism of sound ideas such as in the last six weeks glorified Massachusetts from the Cape to the Berkshire Hills.

There was a shamefully large vote in Massachusetts, however, for utterly absurd political ideas. The cities of this state elected an inflationist governor. This occurs in the green young days of Massachusetts, when as yet her factory populations are comparatively content. There is no posture of safety in politics in this country except that which looks forward to a third and fourth centennial, and makes preparations in advance for perils of which as yet we hardly see the outlines.

Germany, with the pistols of assassins at the breast of her Emperor,

concludes that the evils of suppressing socialism are fewer than those of allowing it freedom of speech. Russia, under an Emperor who has manumitted the serfs, is of a similar mind. A deep growl comes up from the Nihilist, atheistic party in Russia, and the Emperor is told over and over that, if he does not want reforms from below, he must institute them from above.

A remnant of the Parisian Commune exists in America. If it were worth while to discuss the small influence of these desperadoes, I might pause to describe the pestilent organization in New York now headed by Edmond Megy, a ruffian who assisted prominently in the murder of Archbishop Darboy and other hostages at La Roquette, in Paris, in 1871. For the crime of another murder the villain had been condemned to twenty years in the French galleys. After burning the Palace of the Legion of Honour, he fled to London, and then to New York. He may now be seen, not infrequently, presiding over banquets where ribald songs are sung, all things sacred blasphemed, and foul and ferocious speeches, in support of communism and socialism, made by drunken men to drunken audiences. Justus Schwab, of the Socialistic Labour party, and Megy are excellent friends, and when lately the latter was arrested, the former procured him bail and conducted his defence. Olivier, Hauser, Robinet, members of the Paris Commune, are fellow-workers with Megy in New York. The most frequent inculcation of their newspaper, *La Centralization*, is: "Use lead if you would get bread."

The Socialistic Labour party in the United States was founded by German political refugees, some five years ago, and is now supposed to contain 25,000 members who can vote. Here, in the language of its leaders, is a brief statement of its aims:—

"The entire overthrow of the present social system; the abolition of all personal property in land and other means of production, and their cession to the State; the introduction of the co-operative plan in labour, so that every labourer may be a partner in every factory or workshop; the compulsory limitation of the hours of labour to eight hours a day, or less, according to the requirements of the unemployed workmen; the regulations of the prices of labour by arbitration between the employer and the employed until the co-operative system is introduced; compulsory education and the opening of all colleges and universities free to all classes; the abolition of savings banks; the abolition of direct taxation and the institution of a scaled income-tax; and the taxation of all church property."

Dr. Donia, Dr. Stiebling, and R. Sorge assisted in founding this party, and its most prominent New York member is the notorious Justus Schwab. This organization, or party, as you please to call

it, has headquarters at Cincinnati. If you go to that city, and stay three or four days under the smoke of its industrious chimneys, and pick up the eccentric socialistic newspapers which appear in the beer saloons, you will find a strange atmosphere about you, in the moral as well as the physical world. The soot in the physical air is quite noticeable; and here is a specimen of the soot in the political air. It is a labour song, directed against a leading American newspaper and published with editorial approval :

"Whitelaw Reid had best beware!
Hurrah!
Or the working man will make him stare!
Hurrah! hurrah! hurrah!
Let Whitelaw Reid and his pals but dare
The freeman's right to vote to impair,
And their Gatling guns and sabres bare
Will neither save their hides or hair :
For the voter's right our arms we'll bare,
And knives will flash in the angry air!
Hurrah! hurrah! hurrah!"

"What is the oppressed labourer to do now? Let him join with his fellows and light the fires of a glorious revolution, that will rid the world of so many useless aristocrats and make America really, as well as in name, 'the land of the free.' UP WITH THE RED FLAG AND DOWN WITH ARISTOCRACY."

You find several obscure, but not wholly powerless streets in Cincinnati filled with these cheerful doctrines.

Probably the most important of the working men's secret societies in America is what is called "The Knights of Labour." As to this organization there is very little public information. The leading newspapers of New York claimed last August that there were then eight hundred thousand men in it. Certain police agencies which have been set at work in Chicago have investigated this society; and when I came last summer upon their records I was greatly interested to notice how the information published at New York was confirmed by that collected at Chicago. Some of the sharpest detectives on the continent have investigated this society within the last six months. It appears that the Knights of Labour are really a large and perhaps a formidable secret organization. The names of its leading officers, its passwords and oaths have been published. It is not socialistic; but, under the influence of demagogues, might probably be led to organize widespread strikes and riots with little cause.

When a great political party arises making a financial issue of an insane sort, the multitudinous secret lodges of all kinds are under strong temptation to unite. Even Justus Schwab, in New York, has

a certain influence with the rougher class of voters. I know that in New York City an investigation was lately made as to the Socialist Labour party, and it was found that only 800 men in that city and 500 in Brooklyn belonged to its organizations. Of these a thousand were Germans, and of these three-quarters were saloon-keepers. Not more than half a hundred Americans were enrolled. There were only a few Irish. But the Knights of Labour are largely under American control. According to their own statement, what they mean is to protect labour against capital, and to do this, if necessary, by inaugurating simultaneous strikes in different parts of the country, especially at railway centres, and by acquiring and using political power to cripple capital and support the interests of the working men.

Before this course of lectures on socialism is concluded you may think that I am a friend of the working man and the enemy of capital. You will probably hiss me on this platform for several things that I mean to say in favour of labour; and I shall be very glad to be hissed first for what I intend to say in favour of capital. I do not want the question concerning capital and labour settled according to the ideas of labour on the one hand, nor according to those of capital on the other, but according to the ideas of the Christian commonwealth, which are very different from those of either party.

The Knights of Labour held a national convention at Reading, adopted a constitution for the whole country, disbanded, and nobody knew they had met. The fact was ascertained by going back upon their record, after detectives were set to work. One thing that brought out the character of the Knights of Labour was their initiation of Catholics and the refusal of the initiated Romanists to be perfectly frank in the confessionals. In Western Pennsylvania a Romish priest found it difficult to obtain information concerning the Knights of Labour. A man in the confessional was under some obligation higher than that binding a Romanist to his church, and, of course, the priest found occasion to investigate the whole topic. By-and-bye it was announced that the sacraments would be denied to any Romanist bound by an oath of higher obligation than the tie which unites a Catholic to his Mother Church. This, of course produced commotion among Romanists, and they for a time were slow to join the Knights of Labour. A chief in a central committee in that organization, Mr. Stevens, issued a secret circular, announcing that Bishop O'Hara, in Pennsylvania, had seen the ritual and approved the order. Bishop O'Hara had said nothing of the sort, and this unauthorized use of his name caused him to announce that

he could not and would not recognize any body of men as worthy of the sacraments who were connected with the oath-bound society. The Knights then ordered that the oath of secrecy should not be binding on a member in the confessional. Many Romanists have taken this oath; but the Catholic Church opposes secret organizations and has kept thousands out of them. Here and now, in the presence of a Protestant audience containing as much intelligence, perhaps, as any other Protestant gathering that meets weekly on the continent, I, for one, beg leave to thank the Romish Church for its attitude concerning secret socialistic societies.

The trades unions of the United States are not socialistic; but they desire political power, and will accept aid from socialistic secret organizations in obtaining it. The Nationals will do the same, and have done so already.

You had 28,500 skilled and unskilled labourers, male and female, out of employment in Massachusetts June 1st, 1878. * If you estimate the number of the unemployed in the United States according to the proportion in Massachusetts, they will not reach three millions, as the socialists assert; but they are likely within this century to amount to nearly two. It is said that the pestilent financial heresies now in the air have succeeded at the polls whenever secret organizations have surrounded the ballot-box, and that one reason why they were not more successful in New England is that our territory is not undermined yet by these societies.

A million and a half of voters in secret organizations, spreading steadily under the soil; two million unemployed people in the United States; and demagogues searching north, south, east, and west for pedestals! I foresee not ruin in the American national future under universal suffrage, but painful political and social crises, unless, by public discussion, by justice, by Christian philanthropy, by the central ideas of the Christian commonwealth, we prevent the formation of an unprincipled, an ignorant, and an unemployed class; bring the controlling power in politics into loyalty to sound ideas; estimate men neither by the bags of gold nor by the windy socialistic philosophies on which they may happen to ride, but by character; and proclaim all classes friends who are loyal to the Throne which has foundations, and all enemies who are opposed as rebels and as traitors to that supreme government.

* Report of Bureau of Labour on the Unemployed in Massachusetts, p. 4.

RICH AND POOR IN FACTORY TOWNS.

Prelude.—The Free Religionists and Obscene Literature.

As the agent for the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice was engaged in the performance of his duties at Newark, not many years ago, he was stabbed twice by a criminal who had been making an infamous use of the mails under eighteen different aliases and through fifteen post-offices. The second blow of the dagger laid open a great flesh wound in the face, severed four arteries, and came very near being fatal.* It is with men of the type of this assassin that the majority of the National League of Free Religionists have now publicly struck hands in demanding the total repeal of the laws which repress in the United States the most abominable traffic known to the leprous outlawry of the ghouls and ogres of the city slums. I am not speaking at random nor in haste. Utterly incredible as the news may appear to excellent people, who are slow to believe reports of ghastly crime and too busy to attend to the obscure performances of infidel conventions, the following facts are all matters of painful public notoriety in Boston, and susceptible of the most explicit proof from the pages of the Free Religionist official publication, which I hold in my hands.

1. A Free Religious infidel lecturer has lately been arrested in Boston and sent to Dedham jail for making an immoral use of the mails.

2. A meeting in sympathy with this public criminal was held by Free Religionist infidels in Boston, in Faneuil Hall.

3. At the National Convention of Free Religionist infidels at Syracuse, in October, a large majority of the 138 representatives of Cultured Free Thought present there elected a set of officers known to be in favour of the total repeal of the present United States laws against the immoral use of the mails.

4. A minority at this convention seceded, and formed a new National Liberal League, of which the object is to make the postal laws loose, rather than to repeal them, so far as they touch the topic of the distribution of infamous matter.

5. Men under indictment for crimes against the postal laws were prominent at the Syracuse Convention, and their sentiments are reflected in the action of the majority.

6. The lawlessness of the majority is officially denounced by the loose minority in terms too scathing to be publicly cited.

7. Official and unofficial authorities agree that the public language of the men and women representing the majority of the Free Religionist Infidel Convention of Syracuse was unreportably odious, immoral, and vile.

8. According to the official confession of the minority, therefore, the principal branch of the National League of Free Religionists is now in alliance with criminals of the most low and infamous type.

At Syracuse the National Infidel League of Free Religonists, so far as their principal organization is concerned, transformed themselves into a national lepers' league of moral cancer planters. There are several things that injure a man more than to cut his throat. An honourable daughter dead is mourned less than a daughter dishonoured. I know a school of superb culture, a temple of sanctity

* First Annual Report of the N. Y. Society for the Suppression of Vice, p. 9.

where three hundred young women are gathered under the very best religious influences and the loftiest educational incitements. I have wandered up and down the halls of the palatial building in which their instruction is given; I have admired the works of art there; and had occasion to study minutely the enthusiasms for art, and social improvement, and religious usefulness, which fill that school and vivify its lofty regard for intellectual culture. But this institution publishes no catalogue. Why? Go to the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, to the Boston Society, or to the Committee which have been organized to suppress vice at Providence, and New Haven, and Cincinnati, and St. Louis, and Chicago, and you will find that school catalogues are made the lattice-work through which moral lepers and assassins, secretly, at night, under the cover of the mails, throw their poison into seminaries of all grades. *It is a terrific sign of the times when shrewd men of affairs, conducting a great school, dare not publish a catalogue.* The criminals whom the Free Religionist infidels encourage make this caution necessary. I show you the caution in actual exercise. Within twenty miles of Boston the resplendent school I have described stands in its stately park; and within fifty rods of this platform is a hall, the most honoured in this city, where a meeting was held in sympathy with the Free Religionist criminal who is now in Dedham jail. The thoughts which these facts suggest cannot be publicly expressed; but if they did not incite to moral rage our apathy would itself deserve to be smitten with thunderbolts.

Daniel Webster once found Faneuil Hall shut to himself and his political friends. A hundred signatures opened it last summer to sympathizers with a moral cancer planter! All your reputable press was against the meeting. Boston, so far as she noticed any such gathering of apologists for a convicted criminal of the most infamous type, shuddered at it. This city believes in free speech and the right of assembly; but not in moral assassins in masks. Is it quite decent or safe to give the enemies of Boston an opportunity to injure its good name? Is freedom of speech to be carried so far that speech becomes so free that it could not be reported and sent through the mails without being actionable at law? It is evident from the New York press and Syracuse journals, and from the testimony of this infidel paper which I hold in my hands, that the language of the defenders of the successful majority of Free Religionists at Syracuse was so infamous that it could not be reported, published, and sent through the mails without subjecting the newspapers thus publishing it to prosecution.

A small minority, less than a quarter, of the Syracuse Convention seceded from it, and protested against the action of the majority; and this minority thinks itself very virtuous, because it wishes to have a little restriction put upon the immoral use of the mails. But, after all, what does even the seceding party want? The editor of the special organ of that party drew up and submitted to the proper committee a series of resolutions, and he prints them in columns now before me, and one of their first requirements is, "that no indecencies of a merely incidental or occasional character, *however* reprehensible and deserving of public censure on moral or literary grounds, shall cause a forfeiture of the freedom of the press or constitute a just reason for legal prosecution or punishment." That is the style of law the minority wants—a law with loopholes in it large enough to drive a coach-and-four through. This same set of resolutions asks for "a new legislative provision requiring that the *entire* publication, for circulating which through the mails any person shall be prosecuted in the United States courts, shall be set forth in the indictment." Who does not see what these provisions mean?

There were two parties at Syracuse, this paper alleges—one for repeal and one

for reform. A more accurate statement would be that there were two parties there —one for lawlessness and one for looseness. There was a party there in favour of no law, and there was a party there in favour of a coach-and-four loophole law. I respect the remnants of virtue in this little minority. The editor of this paper says that when the minority resolved to secede their action was a great and to him "unexpected" protest, and "filled him with awe." The epic dignity with which the collisions between the petty factions of this small convention are described in this official sheet reminds one of Horace's description of the trip of the country mouse and the city mouse to Rome.

> "*Jamque tenebat*
> *Nox medium cœli spatium.*"
> —"*Satires*," Book II., vi.

In language approvingly cited from the brave Syracuse Standard into this official organ of the Free Religionists (November 7th, 1878, p. 535) I read that "Rivers, of Boston, now resting under indictment for the sale of infamous literature, urged a square expression of the congress in favour of his views. He wanted the United States authorities rebuked for what they had done. Wakeman, of New York, a supporter of Rivers, was more politic, and hesitated about giving the minority such open cause for disruption. He, and others who stood with him, feared the odium which would fall upon them if the minority should secede on the ground that they could not live without those who sustained and fostered the sale of infamous literature and sought to repeal the laws making the sale a crime. Wakeman believed the majority had better make concession, rather than be compelled to stand alone before the public; and, hence, the committee on resolutions fixed up a compromise that the postal-law question should not be touched by either party."

The scheme was that nothing should be said on the subject for another year. That is, that on this stupendous theme, this blazing matter of common morality and decency, a convention of the representatives of cultured free thought should not know its own mind for a year! A promising compromise was patched up on this precious basis; and then the majority, violating it, elected a board of officers composed, according to the official statement, of men "known or believed to be strongly in favour of repeal, as opposed to reform of the postal-law of 1873." Thereupon, when a vote had been taken electing a president by the majority of seventy-eight votes, leaving only fifty-one to the man who represented the minority, the latter seceded, and thirty-four of them signed a protest. A few more names were obtained afterwards, and the result of all is that there are now two Liberal National Leagues.

The local leagues which furnished the majority at Syracuse are scattered through many States, and their lecturers can be relied upon to teach the abominable doctrines of that majority. The evil of such inculcations is not a small one, and frankness concerning it will be justified by all thoughtful friends of moral order. At Toronto, not long since, and at Chicago, I met representatives of Free Religion distributing documents at the door of my lecture halls. I have heard of them in St. Louis, and in Cincinnati, and in Rochester, Baltimore, Washington, and New York.

In this same official organ* I find language cited from the faithful Syracuse press that I dare not read. You would drive me out of the door yonder if I were to recite language that was uttered at Syracuse by Free Religionist women.

---

* First Annual Report of the N. Y. Society for the Suppression of Vice, p. 9.

"But one question arose for consideration, and that related exclusively to infamous literature. By persistent, as well as quiet effort, a majority of the League was composed of free-lovers and infamous literature defenders, and from first to last they were determined upon making a point in favour of its free circulation. Their remarks sometimes almost polluted the atmosphere of the Opera House." The sense of what remains of this official extract is that, if Thomas Carlyle's advice concerning raw sceptics had been followed, and the majority had been covered under a glass bell, the atmosphere there would have caused them to perish in their own corruption.

God be thanked that behind this scheme of infidelity for the immoral use of the mails, there is most significantly little financial strength. It is officially stated * that the balance of money which will remain in the treasury after paying all bills had been "carefully gathered and husbanded for the cause of state secularization," and that it will now "be turned over to the cause of repeal"—that is, of lawlessness. The Free Religionists have had an organization more than ten years. They have swept the Pacific coast; they have officers at work in the Mississippi Valley; they have skilful men as agents. Some of them have ability. I suppose some of them have wealth. But, after more than ten years of effort, sweeping the whole broad floor of this Union, there occurs this division, and the amount of plunder to be carried off amounts to "nearly 200 dollars." God be thanked for this phenomenal impecuniosity!

Large sums are now required by the societies of Boston and New York for the suppression of vice, and are called for by such men as Howard Crosby, Dr. William M. Taylor, Stephen H. Tyng, Jr., William E. Dodge, and Dr. John Hall. I might name in a similar connection a dozen of the prominent leaders of thought of the great metropolis and in Boston, and of all the religious creeds.

God has said that whoever offends one of His little ones, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and he drowned in the depths of the sea. Is there no granite left in Massachusetts of the old-fashioned sort out of which millstones can be made for the necks of cancer planters?

Both these schismatic organizations, the majority and the minority, have presidents in Boston. I have in my hand the list of officers of both bodies, and I find that the chief of them are from this cultured city. They are nearly all men unknown to me. I do not know even the philosophical school-boy who edits this paper. In the list of officers of the seceding Liberal League we have the names of Mr. Frothingham of New York, Mr. James Parton of Newburyport, and Colonel Robert G. Ingersoll of Peoria, Ill. The finance committee, composed of three members, is from Chelsea and Boston. This is the party of looseness, as opposed to that of lawlessness. This is the minority which, turning state's evidence, now denounces the majority, and so gives us at last official authority to proclaim as an indisputable historical fact that the word "Infamy" is written across the forehead of the majority of the Syracuse representatives of Free Religion on this continent.

> "Do but behold yon poor and starved band,
> And your fair show shall suck away their souls,
> Leaving them but husks and shales of men.
> There is not work enough for all our hands;
> Scarce blood enough in all their sickly veins
> To give our naked curtle-axes stain."
>
> —*Shakespeare, Henry V., act* iv., *scene* 2.

---

* First Annual Report of the N. Y. Society for the Suppression of Vice, p. 9.

The Lecture.

God grant that the day may never come when American society shall be divided between the unemployed rich and the unemployed poor; the former a handful, the latter a host! If in Europe large parts of society are thus separated from each other to-day, the fact is not solely the result of the existence there of kings and aristocrats. It is a consequence, at least in part, of influences operating on this side of the Atlantic, as well as on the other, and especially of the great laws of the manufacturing populations which produce under democracies, as well as in aristocracies, if allowed to operate untutored by Christian philanthropy, a rich employing class and a poor operative class. I need only to invoke the visible presence before this assembly of the lofty spirits of Sir Robert Peel and Lord Shaftesbury, to suggest sufficiently the historic perils of congregated labour under the factory system in large towns. Would that in the air above every manufacturing centre of New England Robert Peel and Lord Shaftesbury, colossal and admonitory in archangelic stature, might each stand to teach, with one hand pointing toward Old England and the other stretched as a shield over New England, and methods of avoiding here the perils which have arisen there!

What are the causes which separate the rich and poor in manufacturing populations?

Two great principles rule modern manufactures. They are:

1. That subdivision of labour increases the skill of the workman; and,

2. That other things being equal, the larger a manufacturing establishment the greater the profits.

These are the organizing laws which explain most of the phenomena of manufacturing populations, and will continue to explain them for ages to come, although it is only in the last age that the laws can be said to have been discovered.

On the other hand, it is the principle of subdivision of labour which confines the modern operative more and more to some single detail, the work upon which, after it becomes a habit, calls into activity only a few of the mental powers, has in it no variety, and so does not develop the mind by tasking it at different points; is in itself of only petty importance, and so excites little enthusiasm in labour and even little pride of skill. De Tocqueville, in a celebrated passage, discussing the modern science of manufactures, asks what can be expected of the human intelligence, when, year after year, for twelve or ten hours a day, it is occupied in the single detail

of making heads for pins.* The principle of subdivision of labour has an inherent tendency to dwarf the operative mind unless the most powerful stimulants are applied outside of factory hours to develop the faculties which the manufacturing work never calls into activity. Outside of factory hours! Those words are lightly uttered only by the inexperienced in operative life. Outside of factory hours there are, properly speaking, for operative populations, tasked ten or twelve hours a day, in close apartments, no hours at all. The labour of the mill or of the mine, which goes on in all weathers with the invariability of the sun in its courses, is not to be compared with agricultural labour, interrupted by the changes of the seasons and even of the daily sky. Twelve hours or ten in a factory, and then three hours or two enthusiastic pursuit of mental culture! No eyes yet born are destined to see that wonder grow common. There are a few mental and physical constitutions vigorous enough to combine these two sets of hours, and so to counteract the narrowing mental effect of labour for years at one unvaried mechanical detail. But the mass of operative populations can be expected to exhibit no such physical, to say nothing of such mental and moral vigour. They are swept remorselessly under the wheels of subdivision of labour and long hours. I put the question to persons here who have had any experience of long walks how much vigour is left to a child tending a machine and walking fifteen or twenty miles a day, or a woman tending a machine and walking thirty a day, and day after day, six days in a week. In women and children, who constitute nearly half of operative populations, how much life is left for mental culture, after ten hours' severe labour in a mill? But subdivision of labour increases skill; increase of skill increases productiveness; increase of productiveness increases profits; and long hours are the scythes that reap the gain. This is the law of manufactures; and it is only saying what is evident in the nature of things, and no less evident in the condition of all manufacturing populations, where factory occupation has been hereditary for three or four generations, that the tendency of the system is to make the operative class inferior, and the inferior yet more inferior. Emerson stood at the door of the factories of Great Britain, and wrote that society is to be admonished of the mischief of the division of labour, by the fact that in three generations the robust rural Saxon had degenerated in the mills to the Leicester stockinger and to the imbecile Manchester spinner, far on the way to be spiders and needles.†

On the other hand, the operation of the principle that, other things

* "Democracy in America," Vol. II. Book II. chap. xx.
† Emerson, R. W., "English Traits," chap. x.

being equal, the larger a manufacturing establishment the greater the profits tends to call out all the capabilities of the minds that lead and organize in manufactures. The larger the manufactory the greater the profits, other things being equal; and so in the greater enterprises of manufactures you must have able men. The master is more and more like a general, and must be capable of large combinations and wide foresight. His business tasks all his faculties, makes him abler, gives him social rank. The occupation requires capacity in the master class, attracts capacity, and tasks capacity. Men of education are often drawn into manufactures by the allurements of the size of the enterprises involved. The tension of mind and the variety of its applications in the conductor of a large establishment are at all points a contrast with the condition of the mind of the operative. By the necessary operation of the two great laws of manufactures, the master is elevated; but the operative, little tasked intellectually and leading a monotonous life, becomes socially lowered and dependent more and more upon the organizing mind above him. These are not peculiarities of Old England. They belong to all manufacturing populations, in New England or elsewhere. There is nothing, I claim, in American institutions that will prevent here the subtle operation of these two great laws. Inevitably, therefore, as the effect must follow the cause, the system of modern manufactures in large populations tends to produce a superior class and an inferior.

New England is explicable by these two laws. Wherever you go into a large American factory town you find these classes in formation. Old England is explicable by these laws. I went through Manchester, in England, carefully studying the poor. Sometimes I walked by open doors, where the filth inside the threshold was as deep as outside. I saw poultry picking up their living not oftener outside than inside these doors. One evening, on the top of an omnibus, I went out into the suburbs of Manchester, and came upon palaces—immense private establishments, with grounds kept in the best English styles. Whose houses are these? They are the masters' houses, manufacturers' homes. This is the country seat of Sir So-and-so, who owns such and such acres of factories in Manchester, under the soot yonder. Where does his workmen live? They must live close to their work, under the eaves of the factories: and I found I had been studying the homes of the operatives employed by these very princes and masters. Skilled operatives' houses in Manchester are often very comfortable; but I am speaking of the condition of the lowest paid labourers. I saw children in mop-rag costume, and with hardly enough of that to cover their nakedness.

There was before me in Manchester what does not yet exist in New England—an hereditary class of operatives. Little by little men had gone down to the squalid condition in hovels, where I saw children fight over a piece of fish dropped from a peddler's cart. I have stood there myself and peeled an orange, and the peel was picked up swiftly from the side-walk and eaten by hungry children. I could shoot an arrow in the street over sixty or eighty children that looked as if they had been unwashed from birth. Within a cannon-shot stood these palaces of the manufacturers. That contrast is seen all through the Old World, and it results from these great principles, that subdivision of labour increases the skill of the operative and that the larger the establishment the greater the profits. The man who manages the great establishment may become rich and can take care of himself; the man who makes the pin-head loses capacity to do anything else. If he loses the opportunity to make that pin's head, he knows no other trade, and may suffer terribly before he can learn one and find another place to work.

What else did I see in Manchester? Near one of the great factories was a long brick building, and I saw women pass it and hand their infants in at the gate. When six o'clock came in the afternoon, I saw these same women coming back, and receiving out of that gate their babes. What sort of housekeeping is that? In the great factory towns in the Old World you often find an establishment near the factory for the care of very young children, while the mothers are in the mills. The girl that must go to the mills and work ten hours a day after she is sixteen is not likely to be a perfect housewife. The certainty is that a hereditary factory population is not the best place in which to seek good housekeepers. In the Old World it is very well known that social rank is lost partly because the art of keeping a home neat is lost. But how is it lost? Because children must work in the mills, to eke out the earnings of the parents. The mother must be bound to the looms, although she ought to be at home taking care of the children. Her babes she must pass into an establishment at the door of the mill, to be taken care of while she is earning something to feed them when she returns. We have seen little of this arrangement yet in New England; but who knows that trade here will not follow these precedents? The operation of the two great laws of manufactures can be foreseen with certainty. We find these laws spinning the two contrasted classes in our New England towns. As years go on, and the first effects themselves become causes, these laws tend to make the superior yet more superior and the inferior yet more inferior. I am not denying the advantages of manufacturing eminence; but stating, as a motive for

public caution, what political economists have long acknowledged as the disadvantages of such eminence.

Even John Stuart Mill, using England as a lens and putting behind that telescope the best eyes of political economy, writes a deliberate chapter * on the Probable Future of the Labouring Classes, and goes so far as to say that he finds the prospect hopeful only because he expects the entire system of wages to be superseded by that of co-operation. But the system of wages is interwoven with the whole structure of modern life, and does not show a tendency to vanish out of history like a morning cloud. The accumulations of wealth fall chiefly to employers, and not to operatives. The distance between the two classes is a result of deep causes, arising from the two great laws of the manufacturing system. It is out of these laws that there inevitably originates what has been called in modern times a manufacturing aristocracy. De Tocqueville, using this phrase, compares the territorial aristocracy of former ages with the manufacturing aristocracy of to-day, and finds the former superior to the latter because it was bound by law, or thought itself bound by usage, as the latter is not, to come to the relief of its serving men and to succour them in their distresses.† I see no charm in democracy that can alter the nature of things. The subtle laws of subdivision of labour and of size of establishment apply to manufactures in New England, as well as in Old England. Under some restraints from the nature of our institutions, they will, notwithstanding, produce here, as there, an employing class and an operative class, and perpetually tend to make the distance between rich and poor in manufacturing populations wider and wider. De Tocqueville thought that the friends of democracy should keep their eyes anxiously fixed upon the operation of these two laws, and that, if ever a permanent inequality of conditions again penetrated into the world, it might be predicted that this is the gate by which it will enter.

In all this I am not blaming capital altogether; nor am I defaming labour. I know how the most of what I have said applies to Old England, rather than to New England. And yet British factory laws are certainly superior to ours. Skilled operatives have good social position in New England. It is the glory of society here that ability is reverenced behind the loom, as well as in the pulpit and at the bar. The dazzling outburst of mechanical inventiveness in America is largely a flame springing up from the skilled operative population. More often than you think, a startling invention comes from the

---

* "Political Economy," Book V., chap. vii.

† "Democracy in America," Vol. II., Book II., chap. xx; also Vol. II., Book IV., chap. vi.

operative, and the patent and profit of it go to the master. The *London Times* says that Greece did not possess in statuary such skill as America exhibits in machines to abridge labour. This Greek element in our civilization lies chiefly in the unskilled operative class.

Nevertheless, I ask persons here who are not under the influence of local prejudice to contrast the foreign operative, as he arrives on our shores, with the American unskilled operative from some farm of New England.

Contrast the present operative population of Lowell with the working-people who fifty years ago in that same city published the *Lowell Offering*. I had shown to me the other day a complete copy of that production, and was assured by a man who knew many of the young women who wrote for it that the articles were really produced by the persons whose names they bear. It is a classic in New England literature, this *Lowell Offering*, wholly composed of productions of operatives in the mills. Many of them were daughters of New England farmers. Some of them came from the homes of professional men. Daughters of clergymen were among the authors. It is a matter of notoriety that the operative populations of Lowell, Fall River, and Lawrence, and other similar towns, have become largely foreign.

When you contrast the general condition of the foreign-born population with that of the American, you should not attribute the difference wholly to the evil effects of the political institutions in the Old World. The two great laws of manufactures have produced most of the traits of the operative class in Great Britain. Even the Englishman has been degraded in England by factory life. You say that the low class operative here is usually a foreigner! We should be more moved if American blood were thus degraded. But in England it is English blood that deteriorates. In the poor whites of the South we have proof that American blood can deteriorate also. Our blood is as capable of deterioration as that of the English by unfavourable conditions of factory life. I remember pacing hours and hours up and down the banks of the canals at Manchester, and watching the mill hands come and go at noon and night. Once I fell into conversation with a group of working men, English to their fingertips, all their ways English, and yet they reminded me of the poor whites of the South. Pallid, half-grown, they had been brought up almost from infancy in the factory rooms and gone to their labour without enthusiasm. They talked of the monotony of their work. "It is the same thing day by day, sir! It's the same little thing!" said one man to me. "One little, little thing over and over and over. We are weary when we get home. We are so tired we do not feel

like reading. We sometimes go to the beer-shop, where there is light and cheer."

You say that the operative class, if allowed shorter hours a day would ultimately patronize the beer-shops all the more; but that is not the proper inference to draw from the seven years of investigation of your Massachusetts Bureau. I hold in my hand a summary of its magnificent work for the last seven years, and I find your officers stating most distinctly that the mass of the operative population in New England do not spend large sums of money upon vice!

3. It is proved by the careful statistical investigations of the Massachusetts Bureau that the wages of children are absolutely necessary to the support of most families of working-men, and that the trouble with the operative class in New England begins now precisely where it did in Old England, with the forcing of the children into the factory too early. Among the causes which separate rich and poor in manufacturing populations is the circumstance that the child of the operative is needed to support his father and mother, and so is crowded into factory-work early, while the child of the master can go to school until he is twenty-one or older. After long delay, Massachusetts has passed a law that no child under ten years of age shall be employed in factories, and that no child under fourteen shall be so employed unless during the year next preceding such employment he shall have attended some public or private day school at least twenty weeks.*

How well is this most righteous law executed? Why, turning over a Boston newspaper last Saturday, in a railway car, I came upon this typical instance:

"Truant Officer John M. Newhall was engaged yesterday in distributing among the shoe manufacturers a copy of the statutes of the commonwealth concerning the employment of children. The truant officer has been instructed to see that the law is strictly enforced. About thirty manufactories were visited yesterday, and in nearly all were found children who were employed contrary to the provision of the statute. The statute provides a penalty of not less than 20 dols. nor more than 50 dols. for each offence. In one manufactory in Market Street, which the truant officer visited, the manufacturer expressed his contempt for the statute and threw it away, at the same time stating that it did not amount to anything, and that the 'employment scare' came around periodically. The shoe manufacturer was advised to read the statute. In this shop were found six children who were employed contrary to the statute."—*Boston Journal*, Nov. 16.

Who is to blame here, the parent or the manufacturer? Look a little more closely into this vital matter. Open the cool statistics of

* Chap. lii. Acts of 1876.

your Massachusetts Bureau of Labour, and read the deductions drawn from the complete return of earnings and expenditures received from four hundred families in this state in 1875. Never before in the history of the world were so many budgets of the poor opened to public gaze. The incisive conclusions officially reached in Massachusetts as to earnings are these.

(1) That in the majority of cases working-men in this commonwealth do not support their families by their individual earnings alone.

(2) That the amount of earnings contributed by wives, generally speaking, is so small that they would save more by staying at home than they gain by outside labour.

(3) That fathers rely or are forced to depend upon their children for from one-quarter to one-third of the entire family earnings.

(4) That children under fifteen years of age supply by their labour from one-eighth to one-sixth of the total family earnings.

(5) That there has been found no evidence or indication that working-men spend large sums of money extravagantly or for bad habits.

(6) That without children's assistance, other things remaining equal, the majority of these families would be in poverty or debt.*

You never will understand the manufacturing population of New England or Old England until you fasten your attention upon the manner in which the necessity of child labour chokes the early education of the operative. Children under fifteen years of age supply by their labour from one-eighth to one sixth the total family earnings of average operative families in Massachusetts. Does this make any difference in the social standing of the operative and employing classes? Does early education amount to anything as a start in life? What spins these two classes, one well-to-do, and the other—I will not say oppressed and down-trodden, but certainly not quite well-to-do and not rapidly improving in intelligence or social position? Two great laws I have discussed here. But you cannot probe the mystery of manufacturing populations to the bottom unless you blame parents themselves for sending their children into factories, when they ought to be at school, and the manufacturer for violating the law which requires education for those children under fourteen years of age.

I blame both parties—the parent and the manufacturer; but there is some excuse for the parent. I look north, south, east, and west, and

* See the "History of the Bureau of Statistics of Labour of Massachusetts," by Charles F. Pidgin, Boston, 1876, p. 83, 84.

find no excuse for the manufacturer. If you please, I have no church, and in this lectureship neither capital nor labour is king. I am determined that this platform shall be put on its knees neither to capital nor to labour, but only to justice.

4. The low wages of the parents are the excuse commonly alleged by families for forcing their children into labour and keeping them out of school. After all, however, working men should see that the competition of children's labour lowers wages. Keep all the children in school who would be there if the law of Massachusetts were executed, and the working men of Massachusetts would have more to do. This competition between child labour and mature labour is a most mischievous cause of the reduction of wages. If parents are not governed by the love of culture for their children, they ought to be influenced by the love of good wages to keep them out of factories when the law requires them to be at school. But here we have the fact that wages are such that a man supporting a family must depend for a quarter or a third of the family earnings upon his children. Half of these, perhaps, will be under fifteen. The temptation is enormous to drive them into factories; and yet, when a manufacturer has these children under his control, and cares nothing for the law and tramples it under foot, I find that manufacturer far more to blame than the poor parent. The latter may be a foreigner, not well acquainted with the value of education in this country. I find that manufacturer grasping and lawless, and worse than the labourer, who may be taking only the necessary steps to secure his daily bread.

You think I am a partisan of a class. You will ascertain that I am a partisan for all the people. I am a friend of the judge, and of the preacher, and of the physician, and of the capitalist. I am also a friend of John and James, and Hans, Patrick, and Michael. The certainty is that we cannot bless or ban any one class as a whole, and that only when both capital and labour are brought up to the height of Christian principle shall we see any solution of the vexed question between them. There is nothing but the Golden Rule that can lead New England out of painful social and political crises on the questions of capital and labour. Say, if you please, that you care nothing for aged people; say that you care nothing for the drunken operative in his old age; say that the interests of advanced life are not to be regarded by Christian civilization. Why, in New England, surely, the little children have a claim to your pity; and these laws for their protection, trampled under foot in every factory town in Massachusetts, have a right to be executed by a vehement and authoritative Christian public sentiment.

5. After the great laws of subdivision of labour and size of establishment, and after the poor education of children and the low wages of unskilled operative labour, we must mention, as a forceful cause of the separation of rich and poor in factory towns, the existence in many places of a floating population, brought into existence by the unsteadiness of the occupation offered by many styles of manufactures. A floating is likely to be a homeless, and so a morally policeless, population.

I beg leave to make a distinction between the fluctuating and the uninterrupted industries. More than one problem is explained for the student of the high theme of the moral and industrial economy of cities by this distinction.

Certain trades produce articles in the very nature of which there are constant and wide changes of fashion. Evidently these articles cannot be accumulated in advance, for the fashions cannot be foreseen at any great distance. A stock of outgrown fashions on the market might ruin these trades. As soon as certain annual fashions are set for the articles these industries have a period of extraordinary activity. When the demand is supplied a period of comparative inactivity follows, until the next set of fashion is determined. If fashions fluctuate annually, these trades fluctuate annually. If fashions fluctuate twice annually, these trades fluctuate twice annually. On the other hand, it is evident that if a trade produces an article in the very nature of which there does not exist this susceptibility to a change of fashion, it may work from year's end to year's end, and accumulate, if need be, a stock of its own products.

The latter is the condition of the coal, iron, woollen, and cotton trades. The former is the condition of the shoe trade.

All trades producing articles of clothing are subject in large towns to vast annual fluctuations in activity. In Boston, for example, the length of the working season for tailors and tailoresses is estimated at ten months ; for shop-work, at ten ; for paper-collar makers, at ten ; for hosiery and rubber and elastic goods, at ten ; for hatters, at eight ; for corset-makers and hoop-skirt makers, at seven and a half ; and for straw-workers, at seven. It seems a mystery that so many workmen, worthy in every way and sure to find difficulty or distress because unable to procure occupation elsewhere, are dropped mercilessly from these employments by the thousand at certain periods of the year. The explanation is simply that these employments produce articles subject to wide, annual, and unforeseen changes of fashion, and cannot accumulate stock in advance that is likely to be outgrown. We are often comfortably told that the wages given in such employments are of fabulous rates, by the day or week. This is not often

the case; but, even if it were, for how many weeks in the year does the working season hold?

There is another class of fluctuating industries, in which the variations of activity arise from the changes of the seasons. Thus the length of the year is estimated for quarry workmen at ten months; for farm labourers at eight; for masons, painters, and plasterers at eight; for brickmakers at seven.

You will mend these lulls, you say? Hundreds of years the artisans in the fluctuating industries which I have just named have tried to mend the lulls in large towns in their trades. They have not succeeded. To do so would be to counteract a natural law. Rapidity of production being one of the causes of the lulls, it is found that as machinery becomes more perfect working seasons tend to become shorter. Machinery grows more perfect every day. It is introduced into large towns more promptly and abundantly than into small.

In a city establishment containing, for example, operatives enough to produce twenty sets or twelve hundred pairs of shoes a day the manager gives out stock enough in the morning to make only twelve or fifteen sets. As the brisk season of work arrives, stock enough is given out to make thirty or thirty-five sets a day, and more help engaged, if it can be found. But as the season of inactivity comes on the stock is diminished again. Perhaps, with a working capacity of twenty sets a day, only stock enough will be given out for twelve or ten sets. Of course, workmen drag on without half enough work for a while; and finally are unoccupied by the thousand.

Precisely here arise the chief industrial perils of the operative class of this branch of manufactures. Precisely here is the origin of large floating populations, with their attendant startling moral perils.

6. Floating populations are largely unchurched populations. They come to manufacturing centres and stay a few months, and go back to their homes. While they are in the mills they live in boarding-houses. They are without churches; they are usually without local property; they are in general without the moral police of family life; and so little by little drop in the social scale.

Where are the men who dare face the whole problem concerning capital and labour? Some such men there are in this audience, and I believe that their right action in our brief day would do much to set fashions for a hundred years to come.

MRS. BROWNING'S "CRY OF THE CHILDREN."

Prelude.

A large, significant star has lately appeared above the horizon of American religious thought, and deserves to be studied by any who watch the signs of the times, although it is peculiarly invisible to the wall-eyed radicalism of portions of Boston and to haughty rationalistic specialists generally. Presumed to be mossy and mediæval, bigoted and even cowardly, the oldest theological seminary in the United States has recently devoted a gift of 50,000 dols. to the foundation of a professorship on the relations of Christianity and Science. I look upon this event as one ray in a dawn standing tiptoe on the mountain-tops and as a cheerful promise of a day which may arise slowly, and yet is likely to bless not the churches only, but literature and politics and science itself.

The religious scholarship of the United States is resolved to know as much as its duties require. It recognizes as just the crescent emphasis of the modern demand for special training on the part of those who are to discuss scientific facts in their religious bearing. This claim of culture at large theological students have themselves been urging in their own secret thoughts for years. Possibly I may be permitted to say that ten years ago, as a student, I was dreaming of a day when such a professorship should be founded; and it may not be improper for an effort as humble as the Boston Monday Lectureship on the relations of religion and science to make a reverent bow in its fourth year, and with proper self-forgetfulness, to this new professorship on the relations of Christianity and Science. Young men have been asking for such a chair of instruction; and not merely theological students, but college graduates in all the professions; and not they only, but studious men of affairs; and not young men only, but aged men also. The most famous of the professors in our American theological schools have waited only for funds to found professorships on the relations of religion and science. If the royal generosity of a lady of Massachusetts has given the oldest theological seminary a chance to establish an official chair of this sort, I have no doubt that similar generosity would start any other of the larger seminaries in the land on a career of similar work. On this topic the difficulty during the last twenty years has been a lack of funds, and not the lack of a purpose to meet scientific men half way, by extending theological training far out toward the field of specialists in biological and psychological science.

It is conspicuously evident that the education of theological students in that circle of subjects which most vitally concern the highest human interests will be wider under this new encouragement than that of any other class of professional students in modern times. Men are not readily admitted to the regular courses of study in theological schools unless they have been through a college course of four years' study. Not a few are seriously asking for a fourth year in theological seminaries.

There is now to be given to professional students of theology special training in both observing and interpreting all facts of strategic value on the whole blazing line of contest, or of agreement, as you please, between religion and science. Some of the Andover phraseology is peculiarly happy. The new professorship has been called a chair founded to discuss the relations between religious and other science,

or between theology and the other sciences. It is not admitted for a moment that in the chair of theology proper the scientific method is applied less strictly to the discussion of religious truth than it is to be in this new department. It is the relation of science to science that we discuss when we take up the topic of religion and science and their connection in modern times.

How surpassingly rich is the field that is before any man who enters upon the investigation of the relations of Christianity or religion at large to science! All biological investigation lies before him as a vast prairie filled with billowing flowers. He is to seek not for every weed; but for the most significant and precious growths. Thus his task is less disproportioned to human strength than it would at first appear. Indeed, it is not his business to know the *materia medica*—that is not important to his speciality; but he must know the consummate flower of all philosophy as applied to biological investigation. Then there is the whole range of psychological study, now connecting itself closely with physiology. There is no blazing question in physiology or in biology that does not cast light into the theological domain. Political economy and social science are to be kept in view, for how can we discuss marriage and communism and democracy, or any of the large modern themes connected with free institutions, without knowing the best political thought of the world? Professor Hitchcock, at New York, lately told his classes that "of all collateral studies not one just now is of more immediate importance to theological students than political economy. The old Hebrew prophets, leaders of public opinion in their day and nation, were more than political economists. They were statesmen."* Were they alive to-day, they would discuss socialism and know how to wield the newly-forged thunderbolts of biology and psychology, as well as of political science.

Such being the field this professorship has the superb courage to enter, its founding means that the mossy, mediæval, cowardly Andover is not afraid of investigation. Religious science proposes to look north, south, east, and west, and never to be wall-eyed. Do sceptics and rationalists propose to do the same thing? American religious scholarship is not afraid of investigation, but founds lectureships and professorships to meet you half way; and what do you found? Where are your colleges? Where are your lectureships? Where are your great endowments? Where are your libraries? Where are your books one hundred years old? I put that question to the four winds, and obtain no answer. We meet you more than half way, and on heights commanding your camps are planting stern lines of artillery. I do not see the heights you are likely to occupy fifty years hence. I do not see how the present defences of materialistic infidelity can survive in a circle of modern artillery fire, that is, of public, clear discussion, which prints itself and enters the open fateful contests of authorship. I do not see that you are likely to hold your camps. I see rather that every intrenchment of materialism is likely to be riddled through and through with the heaviest artillery of intellectual discussion within a hundred years.

Heaven forbid that I should underrate the training of specialists. Everyone respects the specialist; but it is easy to forget how narrow a man's sympathies may become by exclusive devotion to any one branch of merely physical science. The theologian may be guilty of great narrowness of thought if he does not widen himself through contact with the spheres of investigation outside his own. Take Huxley and Tyndall, neither of whom had a university education. They are great observers—probably no men greater; but, from lack of a fit, large, roundabout university training, their sympathies with philosophical and ethical

* "Socialism," p. 52.

themes, in spite of their German studies, are not wide or deep. If you measure them on the side of some of the most blazing topics, it will be found that their training is painfully incomplete. Tyndall's own account of his education* shows that from the very first his mind has been in a trance on the topics of physical science, concerning which he has made discoveries—the molecular constitution of gases, heat as molecular motion, sound as molecular motion. It is natural that his views in philosophy should be unsatisfactory to experts in that department, and that he should see almost nothing except the materialistic side, which, as Lotze says, is the horse, and not the rider.

We need men, trained like Lotze, in both philosophy and physical science, and taking a university degree in each department, if we are to meet the demand of modern discussion.

Andover has founded several new institutions; but no enterprise suggested in that town deserves more praise than the professorship of the relation of Christianity and Science. Under the elms of the hill in Andover is a study in which a prayer-meeting was once held weekly to devise ways and means of doing good. Among its attendants were Stewart, and Woods, and Porter, and Newman, and Adams, and Edwards. There originated the first religious newspaper. There began its existence an American Tract Society, which sifts its printed counsels now like the dew over a hemisphere. There, in imitation of a Scottish custom, was instituted the American Missionary Monthly Concert of Prayer, in response to the wants of an American Missionary Society, also originating in Andover, and on whose operations now the moon goes not down by night nor the sun by day. There had its birth the American Education Society, which to-day rings its college-bells all the way from the Niagara to the Yosemite. There was commenced the American Temperance Society, which in our crowded great cities has before it a work of which even wakeful eyes do not see more than a glimpse of the importance.† The munificence of one woman has founded the Andover Professorship of Christianity and Science. Through its usefulness her days will be long in the land. When serious persons, looking into the future, place thousands of dollars at stake in the founding of a professorship like this new one, the pioneer work or the discussion of the relations of religion and science has passed beyond the stage at which it can be injured by irresponsible anonymous sneers.

THE LECTURE.

MRS. BROWNING, Shakespeare's daughter, summarized fifty years of discussion in Great Britain by these moving words:

"The young lambs are bleating in the meadows,
The young birds are chirping in their nest,
The young fawns are playing with the shadows,
The young flowers are blowing toward the west.
But the young, young children, O my brothers,
They are weeping bitterly;
They are weeping in the playtime of the others,
In the country of the free.

"Go out, children, from the mines and from the city;
Sing out, children, as the little thrushes do;
Pluck your handfuls of the meadow cowslips pretty—
Laugh aloud to feel your fingers let them through!

* *Nineteenth Century.*
† "Half-Century Andover Memorial."

But they answer : 'Are your cowslips of the meadows
Like our weeds anear the mine?
Leave us quiet in the dark of the coal shadows
From your pleasures fair and fine.'

"'For oh!' said the children, 'we are weary,
And we cannot run or leap ;
If we cared for any meadows, it were merely
To drop on them and sleep.
Our knees tremble sorely in the stooping,
We fall upon our faces trying to go ;
And underneath our heavy eyelids drooping,
The reddest flowers would seem as pale as snow.

"'For all day we bear our burden tiring
Through the coal-dark underground ;
Or all day we drive the wheels of iron
In the factories round and round.'"

If this is sentiment, surely it is good political economy as well, and that for both Britons and Americans.

Sir Robert Peel, himself a master manufacturer, said in 1816 to the British Parliament, that unless the tendency of congregated labour under the factory system in large towns to give rise to perils and abuses could be corrected by decisive legislation, the great mechanical inventions, which were the glory of the age, would be a curse rather than a blessing to society.*

1. Congregated labour and a large floating population are historically known as having always heretofore given rise in large towns to grave moral and industrial perils and abuses.

2. The new system of both textile and nontextile manufactures necessitates congregated labour ; and the annual fluctuations of the activity of several trades give rise in many large towns to large floating populations.

It is of high interest to notice that almost precisely one hundred years ago the cotton factory system, on account of new mechanical inventions, was passing through a great transition exceedingly similar to that which the shoe factory system has lately passed through from the same cause. In 1771 Sir Richard Arkwright perfected that marvellous combination of mechanical adjustments known as the spinning-frame. Hargreaves's great invention of the spinning-jenny took place in 1765. Compton's celebrated combination in the mule-jenny of the two preceding machines followed in 1787. In strict analogy with what is now passing before our eyes in the history of a great sister industry, the invention of new machinery in the cotton manufacture revolutionized its process, and the invention of one important machine necessitated the invention of others.

* Hansard's "Parliamentary Debates," vols. xxxi. and xxxiii. Sir Robert Peel's Speech on Motion for Committee, April 3rd, 1816.

But the steam engine had not yet appeared. A factory system, therefore, sprung up in connection with vast establishments located on streams. Of necessity, the sites chosen were, in a majority of instances, at a distance from pre-existing towns and in thinly populated districts. In order to secure permanent labour, a system of apprenticeship was adopted, by which operatives were bound to work for a definite period. The consequence of congregated labour, under no regulation except the unrestrained competition of manufacturers, began to appear. Hardly more frightful abuses have sprung up under the factory system in large towns than sprung up in this first factory system outside of large towns. It is vastly important that you should fix your eyes upon the historical fact that the evils I am discussing are not exclusively incident to residence in cities. A whole generation of boys and girls and youths and men and women of all ages, says one of the most considerate of historians, "were growing up under conditions of physical degeneracy, of mental ignorance, and of moral corruption." The very title of the bill by which Sir Robert Peel began, in 1802, the great series of the English parliamentary acts in promotion of factory reform was: "For the preservation of the health and morals of apprentices and others employed in the cotton and other mills, and in cotton and other factories." The health and morals! Upon these points all the vast mass of English factory legislation turns to the present moment. It is significant to notice that, when congregated labour under the factory system was tried for half a century in England at a distance from large towns, it exhibited, taken by itself and aside from any now outgrown evils of the plan of apprenticeship, a tendency to perils and abuses such as to call for the most decisive parliamentary interference.

The new star of the steam engine blazed across the mechanical sky; took a fixed place in it; and at once there was a new grouping of constellations. The vast manufacturing establishments which existed at a distance from towns were transferred to crowded populations. Between 1802 and 1815 the factory system was transformed into its present shape. It was the birth of the inventions of Hargreaves, and Arkwright, and Crompton, and Watt. It was a system wholly new in the world. Immediately a tendency to perils and abuses appeared, which called for vigorous parliamentary repression. *English Parliaments have not been remarkable for unnecessary interference with trade nor for sentimental legislation.* The larger part of the manufacturing wealth of the kingdom was thrown into the scale against factory reform. But the cause of that reform has steadily advanced, because Parliament has been forced by the terrible revelations of its own commissions of factory inquiry, again and again to interfere. The moral and industrial perils of congregated labour

under the factory system in large towns! It was thought that the tendency of the factory system to these perils was corrected by the great Factory Act of 1833. Eleven years passed. The Factory Regulation Act of 1844 was found necessary. Two years ensued. Interference, always unwelcome to Parliament and always against some of the deepest traditions of English law, was found needful, in spite of previous interference. In 1847 the celebrated Ten-Hour Act was passed. Experience continues to teach. In 1873 the Children's Labour Act is found indispensable. Against every one of these great measures the larger part of the leading manufacturers threw their heaviest influence. I recite before this assembly the list of the great acts of factory reform wrung from Parliament, in Great Britain, to prove the inherent tendencies of congregated labour, under the factory system in large towns, to moral and industrial perils and abuses. A board of factory inspectors, with almost regal powers, sits to-day in London, and subordinate inspectors are located in various districts, making reports to the central office weekly.*

It is a matter of public notoriety that within the last ten years the method of the shoe manufactures has been revolutionized by the invention of the McKay sewing-machine. The invention of the spinning-jenny and of the power-loom did no more to revolutionize the cotton manufacture, the invention of the steam-engine no more to change the methods of inland and maritime conveyance, than the application of the sewing-machine to the shoe trade has done to revolutionize the processes of that branch of industry. The change has been as remarkable for rapidity as for extent. It was hastened by the great exigencies of our civil war. The celebrated machine, which is likely to be remembered in history side by side with the spinning-jenny and the power-loom, was invented and patented by Lyman R. Blake, of South Abington, in this commonwealth, as late as the year 1858. † When the civil struggle began, it was seen that machinery must do the work of the multitudes of mechanics of the North who had left their places and were fighting the battles of the war. The original patent was sold to Mr. Gordon McKay and Mr. J. G. Bates, of Boston, for ten thousand dollars. It was somewhat improved by them. Not far from the second year of the war it began to be applied to the shoe manufactures in establishments in this city. Invention has followed invention. The supply of the wants of the new system of factories has tasked the skill of the best experts in machinery in New England. The McKay sewing-machine,

---

* Von Plener, "English Factory Legislation," with Introduction by Mr. Mundella, London, 1873.

† *Shoe and Leather Record*, Boston, Sept. 26th, 1870.

the skiving-machine, the pegging-machine, the sole-moulding-machine, the cable-wire machine, the self-feeding eyelet-machine are but a fraction of the recent inventions—not only patented, but in use. Any list of machines correct for to-day is likely to be incorrect, because outgrown, to-morrow. Rapid as the supply of the new machinery has been, the demand for it has exceeded and yet exceeds the supply.

Three large results have followed this invention of new machinery. First, the small shop system has been abandoned and the large factory system has been adopted. Secondly, a great subdivision of labour has taken place. Thirdly, the trade is much more subject to lulls or inactive seasons than it was before the invention of the new machinery. Occurring in the largest trade of the United States, these changes are events of a high order of public importance.

The transition from the old system to the new is complete and final. All Eastern Massachusetts is sprinkled thick with small shoe-shops, buildings twelve or twenty feet square, in each of which ten or fifteen men were usually employed on the heavier work of the trade, the females, in their own rooms at home, doing the lighter work. These rooms have been vacated, never to be filled again. For a hundred years they have been almost as characteristic of a large part of the towns of Eastern Massachusetts as the school-houses or the churches. The large factories which are rising to fill their places are destined to become larger and larger. There is no longer any artisan in this trade who makes a whole shoe. Subdivision of labour is sometimes carried so far that a single article passes through the hands of fifty workmen, each of whom is trained only to make a part. As a rule, the old shoemakers were largely independent in the management of their business, each family attending to its own for itself. But the large factories have introduced an operative class and an employing class. In the old system work was commonly steady from year's end to year's end, or affected only by the larger fluctuations of general commerce. But now there are two periods in each year in the trade in any large city when hundreds of operatives are dropped from employment. So far apart at so many points are the old system and the new that it is of little service to reason from the experience of the trade under the former system to the experience it is to expect under the new. It matters little if a man have passed a lifetime under the old system. He must judge the new system by the experiences developed under it, and not by the old.

It is of very great importance, while these changes are passing, to call attention in time to the high duty of setting right precedents in the new system. Let the first twenty years of the new order of things,

or the first ten, be managed carelessly, and the needle will be threaded wrong for fifty years and will not be threaded wholly aright for a hundred. A responsibility of an extent and weight not easily over-estimated rests upon the manufacturing and operative classes who are now organizing a completely new factory system for the largest trade of the nation.

This voluminous document which I hold in my hand is an official copy of the bill now before Parliament summarizing or making laws relating to British factories and workshops, and sure to pass. It has already gone through both Houses, and the provisions of it are sterner than those of Massachusetts legislation to-day. They are in advance of the best laws passed in America for the prevention of industrial and moral perils in congregated labouring populations in large towns. Its summary of fifty years of severe industrial experience is precisely that given in Mrs. Browning's words—the child is the point on which these perils and abuses fasten themselves first of all. As Sir Robert Peel began with legislation to protect children, young persons, and women, so this bill is concerned in more than two-thirds of its extent with the protection of the rights of minors and females. The cry of the children, therefore, is uttered by the gruff vote of the English Parliament, as well as by the searching tenderness of the tones of this greatest of female poets. It is the combination of these two contrasted yet interblending voices of British literature and British legislation that ought to arrest American attention.

If I must summarize swiftly the propositions on which I dare put foot, face to face with the historical experience I have now sketched, I shall not lead you over English ground exclusively, for my feeling is that English factory legislation cannot be transferred as a mass to New England. We have a peculiar political and social life here, and experience in America is needed to guide American legislation. Nevertheless, we can well cast glances upon foreign legislation—in Germany, in France, in Switzerland, in Great Britain, and especially upon this last series of summarized enactments—and examine what has taken place abroad, while we are shrewd enough to study our own peculiar circumstances. Nail, therefore, to the door, as Luther did his theses to a certain church, these propositions. I propose to defend them; but I ask no one to accept my positions:

1. Much modern machinery can be managed by women and children as remuneratively as by men.

2. When a child, or young person, or woman can be hired for fifty or eighty cents a day, and mature labour costs twice or thrice that sum, the temptation to manufacturers is great to hire the cheapest effective labour.

It is said by many that we ought not to interfere with the law of supply and demand. But why have I summarized the English legislation? In order to show you that practically England has interfered for half a century.

3. When, as in Massachusetts, families of operatives depend upon children's earnings for from one-fifth to one-sixth of the family income, the temptation to parents is great to force their children into early labour in the mills.

4. Between the greed of the employers and the necessities of parents, the factory child is thus deprived of a proper education.

5. The wages of mature labour are reduced by competition with child labour.

My purpose is to fasten your attention upon the facts, logically connected, as a chain running through this whole vexed topic of capital and labour. This chain, by the by, is welded by no human hand; and, according to the use we make of its links, it is either the chain that is to choke America severely or the one that will bind back into impotence some of the worst industrial and political evils that assail her.

6. An ignorant operative class is inevitably produced by the neglect of early education of factory children, through the greed of employers and the carelessness of parents.

7. An ignorant is likely to be a more or less helpless and suffering class.

8. An ignorant, helpless, and suffering class naturally becomes a politically and socially discontented, explosive, and criminal class.

9. The law of self preservation, therefore, justified State interference with the relations of capital and labour so far as the regulations of the work and education of children and young persons is concerned.

10. Fifty years of factory legislation in Great Britain, the United States, Germany, and most other civilized States have established the principle of governmental interference in protection of the interests of children, young persons, and women in the trades, though not of men.

Here is the central proposition asserting the necessity of governmental interference, not in the socialistic sense, but in the republican, democratic sense; the principle of governmental interference, in protection of the rights of children, young persons, and women, though not of the rights of mature labour, which is allowed to be boxed about under the laws of supply and demand.

11. No child under ten years of age should be employed in any factory.

The German Social Science Association insists upon it that no married women should be employed in a factory.

12. No child under fifteen should be so employed unless able to show a certificate of an adequate amount of school instruction to be required by law, and also a surgical certificate of physical fitness for his labour.

13. Compulsory education in the common schools is in America a better measure than the English half-time schools for factory children, for the half-time schools foster a class distinction foreign to the spirit of American institutions and are not effective enough to train American voters adequately.

14. But, if the State assumes the care of the education of the child until the fifteenth or sixteenth year, overseers of the poor should be instructed to aid families who suffer from the lack of earnings of children whom the Government requires to be in school.

15. The system of apprenticeship has departed from modern trades, and at present nothing exists in its place.

16. If the State takes the child from the parent until its fifteenth or sixteenth year, the Government should give the child back so instructed as to be able to earn something.

17. Developing schools and school shops might, therefore, be well made to follow for a year or two the common-school instruction; and such schools should be assisted by the State and would constitute the crowning protection of children's rights in the trades.

Such are the seventeen propositions which I would emphasize, but of which I can give almost no expansion; and yet it is necessary to attempt a certain amount of illustration of these positions, and, therefore, I ask you to let me teach by object lessons. I am not speaking to teachers, or preachers, or politicians. I wish any communications representing this platform as a teacher of teachers might be excluded from the public press. I never made and never shall make any such pretensions. I am far from attempting to instruct the leaders of the Massachusetts Bureau or any minister here from a factory town. I am not an agitator by profession. I am here simply and solely as a flying scout, making a report, and I have had a little experience in a manufacturing population. It may be known to some here that I once had the honour, or dishonour, of raising a local breeze by a defence of the rights of working-men's children. I will not dwell on that point, however; for I believe the enemy was whipped, horse, foot, and dragoons. The working-men petitioned two or three hundred strong for a continuance of the discussion of the rights of their children; and, although I am not a partisan for labour or for capital, I must say that you never can convince working-men that he is their enemy who is a friend of their children.

Here is a little child at Fall River. I am reciting a fact out of

the reports of your Massachusetts Bureau. The young creature stands at the edge of a swiftly-moving water to wash a broom, one of the heavy sort, and the racing flood bears the instrument away from her; but she, frightened from fear of punishment, clings to the handle and is drawn in and drowned, for she is not large enough to pull out the broom from the arrowy current.

You will say this is exaggeration; but I went this morning to the best specialist in Boston on the condition of labour, and I think the best in the United States, and put the question: "How many children are growing up in Massachusetts without any instruction from schools, public or private?" "Why," said he, "three years ago I estimated that there were twenty-five thousand; * but to-day I think there are from fifteen to twenty thousand growing up without any instruction worth mentioning, in either public or private schools." Where are they? They are in the factories, where this little child was, and at work. They are crowded out of the schools and into the mills, and they are labouring there day by day. And where are the men whose duty it is to execute the school laws of 1876? Where are the men who are charged in Massachusetts with carrying out our present very excellent system of legislation against truancy? We have heard, for ten years, more or less discussion of the dangers of allowing an ignorant class to grow up in manufacturing cities; but public sentiment has not reached such a state that you can gather out of the Massachusetts sky any very hot thunderbolts—you can gather only thin ones, sheet-lightning merely—for these neglectful parents and still more neglectful and criminal public officers of the law.

What do I want? The legislation of England, which I hold in my hand, provides an efficient board of factory inspectors; and you have nothing of the sort in this commonwealth. Several years your Bureau of Statistics of Labour has been urging the appointment of factory inspectors in Massachusetts, and again and again the topic has been laid aside in the State House. If my feeble voice, assisted by your support, can raise any agitation on this theme, God grant that we may have some influence to secure the execution of the righteous laws of Massachusetts in the matter of compulsory attendance of the schools.

If I were a socialist, I should be personally ashamed to ask for more help than America, when her laws are executed, now gives through the government to the average citizen. Here I am, unable, let us suppose, to pay more than a poll tax, and my wife becomes

* Report of Massachusetts Labour Bureau for 1875, p. 5.

insane. The government watches over her, puts her into an institution, and takes care of her. Here is a child of mine that I cannot educate. The government opens a school for him; pays his tuition bills; provides for him school books, if necessary; and warms the house for him. Here is a child of mine that wishes to follow a certain trade, requiring a technical education. The government gives assistance to schools peculiarly adapted to his wants. I have a child that is deaf and dumb. Massachusetts adopts him into her family, gives him a good room yonder in South Boston, attends to him as I cannot. I have a child that is blind. Massachusetts puts her hand on his shoulder, puts her hand in blessing on his head, guides him to her philanthropic institution for those who are sightless, educates him, places her best talent at his side, and improves his stunted mental perceptions, until as in the case of a Laura Bridgman they touch the Unseen Holy itself and commune with the world beyond sight. You have now done for you, discontented socialist and complaining working-men, as much as you can bear to have done and retain the proper spirit of self-help. All this is what capital regularly and willingly does for labour.

In spite of the danger of undermining the spirit of self-help, I would have the laws requiring the attendance of all the children at the common schools rigorously executed; because without this precaution experience shows that an ignorant class will be formed even in Massachusetts. With very many of our foreign-born operatives there is no proper conception of the value of education in this country.

There are no proper conceptions, I think, in society at large of the value of educating the uncleanest poor. Why, where have many of the greatest inventors come from? Who was Robert Burns? Who is the American Edison? Who was Ferguson, when he lay on his back and stretched a thread before him, put beads upon it, and marked the position of the stars and made a map of the constellations in the peasant's hut? Who was that rail-splitter who was assassinated in Washington at the end of a civil war, and over whose eloquence, as well as over whose statesmanship, every zone of the planet stood hushed in wonder? The talent that lies in the lowest population—how are we ever to know how great it is, unless we bring Burns out from under the thatch, and Ferguson up from his peasant's hut, and our Edison into proper employment, and our Lincoln from his hovel up and up, until he finds the place God made for him, at the summit of political power in the foremost nation of modern times? Where are the lax executors of law and the fleecers and tempters of the poor, who keep the veil of vice or ignorance hung over the eyes of the lower populations? A man very rarely finds out

what great things are in him until he drops all the weights that impede his race. He does not know how swift he can be until every bad habit is sloughed off. Where are the men who execute the laws against intemperance? Shut your grog-shops, open your schools, and God knows what flashing jewels you may yet dig out of the neglected ores at the very bottom of the unwrought mine of the modern world.

Am I venturing too much in saying that the English half-time schools, effective as they have been, are hardly adapted to our New England civilization? We have had recommendations of these schools from the early officers of the Massachusetts Bureau; but in representing my own opinion concerning them I am representing also that of the present officers of the same Bureau. I understand these officers to affirm that the half-time schools cultivate a class feeling, and give the factory child a perception from the first that the order to which he belongs is divided sharply from the upper orders. These schools do not contain that inspiritment which comes from the friendships always formed between boys of all grades of society when they are mingled in the common school. My investigation of this topic of factory legislation leads me to reverence the ideas of our fathers concerning common free schools. Any attack on that system is sure to produce socialistic political mischief, as well as great moral peril in the United States. We may easily secure the execution of compulsory laws concerning the attendance of factory children at school. Let us make no distinction among citizens on the ground of occupation, any more than on that of colour. In this particular we can mould our legislation in America on a pattern better than the models of the Old World.

I am not underrating the half-time schools of England. They have been tried in Massachusetts to some extent; but practical experience in Great Britain shows that they are a clumsy expedient and can easily be abused, and after all do not give an education sufficient to meet the demands of the American voter in our modern political arrangement in America. In the cotton districts of England, where a half-time school law has been in operation since 1833, it was found in 1866 that thirty-seven per cent. of the children were unable to read.

Massachusetts at this hour stands in a position to be an example, if she executes her legislation concerning the instruction of children. Technical education in art has struck root at last. A committee of your citizens appointed by the American School Science Association strongly recommended that a developing school and school-shops should be established by the city or state or an endowed corporation, and that the gap left by the desuetude of the system of apprenticeship should

thus be filled, the aptitude of pupils ascertained, and trades taught them in outline. The worth of the articles produced in such schools would probably pay expenses, after a short time.*

Very interesting is it to observe that as the older America entered this continent at the Massachusetts coast, so the manufacturing America enters at the same quarter. Plymouth Rock was the foundation of a church; the problem of our industrial future is how to make it, without any hewing of its savage outlines of justice, the foundation of the factory. Yes, I mean all this implies. Plymouth Rock, or, in other words, unhewn justice, is to be the foundation of our factory legislation. Plymouth Rock, the corner-stone of industrial, as well as political institutions. Plymouth Rock, the corner-stone not only of the Church which Old England was, but of the factory which the new New England is and will be more and more.

In the famous English bill which I hold in my hands a child is defined as a person under fourteen years of age; a young person as one between fourteen and eighteen; and a woman as a female over eighteen. Now, no child in Great Britain, according to these new laws, and no young person or woman can be employed in textile factories except as follows:

1. Young persons and women work from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., or 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., and on Saturdays from 6 a.m. to 1 p.m. Two hours a day on five days of the week and half an hour on Saturday must be allowed for meals. Continuous employment, without a meal-time of at least half an hour, is not to exceed four hours and a half.

2. Children are employed for half-time only, in morning and afternoon sets, on alternate days. The work-day is the same as for women and young persons. No child can be employed on two successive days, nor on the same day in two successive weeks.

3. The employment of young persons at home, where the work is the same as that done in the factory, but no machine power used, is also regulated.

4. Employers must obtain a weekly certificate of school attendance for every child in their employment.

5. Medical certificates of fitness for employment are required in the case of children and young persons under sixteen.

6. Dangerous machinery is to be fenced, and children and young persons are not to be employed in cleaning machinery in motion.

7. Strict sanitary regulations preserve the cleanliness of the factories.

---

* See a report by S. P. Ruggles, Wendell Phillips, Edward E. Hale, and others, read at the annual meeting of the American School Science Association, in Boston, January 10th, 1877.

8. The factory law of Great Britain is administered by two sets of officers, appointed by the Secretary of State—inspectors, charged with the duty of examining factories and workshops at all seasonable times, and certifying surgeons to grant certificates of fitness under the act.*

What I want is pretty nearly as much as Great Britain has, except her undemocratic half-time schools.

"Still all day the iron wheels go onward,
Grinding life down from its mark;
And the children's souls, which God is calling sunward,
Spin on blindly in the dark.

"How long, how long, O cruel nation,
Will you stand to move the world on a child's heart,
Stifle down with mailed heel its palpitation
And tread onward to your throne amid the mart?
Our blood splashes upward, O gold-heaper,
And your purple shows your path;
But the child-sob in the silence curses deeper
Than the strong man in his wrath."

MRS. BROWNING, "*The Cry of the Children.*"

---

* *Encyc. Britannica*, ninth ed., vol. viii, p. 845. See also official copy of the bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to factories and workshops, House of Commons, 9th April, 1877.

SEX IN INDUSTRY.

Prelude.—Canada and its Prospects.

There came yesterday from Windsor Castle a message, sent by what Tennyson calls

"Thunderless lightnings smiting under seas,"

to the fourth daughter of Victoria at Montreal: "Delighted at reception. Say so. The Queen." Although Canada occupies so large a place in the minds of Britons that the Marquis of Lorne publicly affirms that Montreal is the best-known city on this continent—Boston is here!—I undertake to affirm that Americans in general have not heard of anything happening in Canada since 1867, when the union of the provinces was formed. We are as oblivious of what occurs on the other side of the St. Lawrence as Englishmen in general are as to what happens on this side of the Atlantic. Nevertheless, Canada at this moment is the fifth maritime power in the world.

The mouth of the St. Lawrence is shut fully five months of the year by ice. Commercial reasons, it was presumed by some, would lead Canada to seek annexation to the United States after the repeal of the reciprocity treaty. That agreement was negotiated by Lord Elgin, in 1854, and abrogated in 1866. This city of Boston had a trade of more than 27,000,000 dollars annually affected by its provisions. The union of the British American provinces was an accomplished fact fifteen months after the repeal of the treaty. Most urgent commercial forces hurried on this coalescence. Canada, before the confederation, was an inland province. Its chief winter gates to the ocean were New York, Boston, and Portland. Now it has a seaboard. The country of Evangeline's Acadie, which Longfellow annexed to American hearthstones, is startled by the thunder of railway passage.

> "This *was* the forest primeval. The murmuring pines and the hemlocks,
> Bearded with moss and in garments green, indistinct in the twilight,
> *Stood* like Druids of old, with voices sad and prophetic."

At a public expense of 20,000,000 dollars the Intercolonial Railway has been undertaken, to secure free communication on Canadian soil to and from the inland cities and Halifax and St. John on the Atlantic. The Bay Verte Canal connects the waters of the St. Lawrence and of the Bay of Fundy. Various other means of intercommunication have been improved, so that the shutting of the mouth of St. Lawrence in the winter does not prevent the access of Canada to the ocean. That is never frozen. To-day Canada is a competitor with the United States in the ports of the West Indies and of South America, and in case of certain articles in those of Great Britain herself. It is quite worth while for merchants to cast an eye toward the Dominion of Canada, even if politicians have no reason to look that way. The repeal of the reciprocity treaty has drawn the British Provinces closer together. The interchange of traffic, which from 1820 to 1866 was largely in favour of the United States, underwent so great an alteration from 1866 to 1873 as to show a balance against the United States, and in favour of Canada, of 51,875,000 dollars.

Lord Derby said, a few years ago, that everybody knew that Canada must soon become an independent nation. He has changed his mind since, and is now a re-

presentative of the rising tide of imperialism ; but at this hour not a shilling of British public money comes to Canada, although a viceregal government is accepted there with acclamations.

As members of one political family, Upper and Lower Canada have led an uneasy life together. A proposition first made in 1822 for the political union of these two provinces bore no fruit until 1841, when the union of Upper and Lower Canada was effected.

On the fertile banks of the lower St. Lawrence there is a French population living in a state of prolonged childhood under Romanism, a happy people, ignorant, industrious, social, but not progressive; and yet capable, when held together by the ties of race, language, and religion and exploited by Romish ecclesiastical and civil politicians, of exerting important influence in politics. Lord Elgin once said that it would be easier to make the French Canadians American than to make them English. Lower Canada is a part of France unreformed by the Revolution of 1792. The Romish Church of Louis XIV. yet collects its tithes on the Eastern St. Lawrence. The Jesuit is active there.

Upper Canada, filled chiefly by British emigrants, was often divided between the political opinions of Britons. There the English, the Scotch, and the Irish were not infrequently separated by old party lines. In nearly every case, when a division occurred among the English-speaking populations of Canada, Lower Canada could have her way. The revenue came principally from Upper, but the disposal of it was often determined by Lower Canada. Therefore, in the former a demand arose for union with the other English-speaking provinces, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. During our American war Upper and Lower Canada both felt that they would be stronger against attack if all the British provinces were united. Thus domestic political reasons, as well as commercial causes, originated the great act of union of 1867. Imitating the United States, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick became one political power, with independent local institutions. In 1870 young Manitoba, radiant with hope, stood up in the sunset and was married to the Dominion. In 1871 British Columbia, on the hoarse Pacific, came into the Union. Prince Edward Island followed in 1872. Labrador is politically attached to Newfoundland, and a provision exists by which the latter can be admitted to the confederacy. The rights of the Hudson Bay Company now belong to Canada. The vast north-west territory waits for admission to the Dominion. All British America, in short, is practically a political unit, under a viceregal governor-general and privy council, a senate, and an elective House of Commons. In Ontario and Quebec every male subject who is the owner, or occupier, or tenant of real property of the assessed value of 300 dollars has a vote.

What are the divergencies of race in the different populations represented in this dominion ? What are the differences of religion ? Fifty years ago there were only a million people in British North America. Now there are more than four millions. Of these 1,082,940 are of French descent; 850,000 Irish ; 700,000 English; 550,000 Scotch ; 230,000 German and Dutch. Looking at the disparities of the religious creeds, you find 1,492,000 of the Romish faith ; 567,000 Wesleyans and Methodists ; 544,000 Presbyterians ; and 494,000 Anglicans.* Next after the Romanists, the Wesleyans and Methodists are the most powerful religious body in the Dominion at this hour.

I am not discussing Canada with the purpose of raising the question whether its annexation to the United States is ever to take place. I believe average

* Census of April 3rd, 1871. See "Statesman's Year Book," 1878, p. 511.

American sentiment is now as careless on that topic as it is on most others that affect Canada. We have not of late sought the annexation of Cuba. Since slavery was abolished we have not been making aggressions on our south-western frontier. We have borne with petty insult after petty insult from Mexico without any military reply, and, indeed, without enough protest to protect our own interests. The United States did not purchase Alaska. Mr. Seward bought that. We are the nation which refused to annex San Domingo. In short, the American people understand perfectly well that despotic power may annex territory; but that a republic can only incorporate territory by its own free vote.

If ever the day comes when Canada thinks that she can do better than to remain substantially an independent power, receiving nothing from Great Britain but a viceregal governor and protection in case she is attacked, Americans will undoubtedly welcome her to the Union; but only on her own free choice. I believe we are careless about the time when she shall come. Professor Goldwin Smith is very anxious to have the date occur early. The great forces in history prevail; and these, he thinks, make for the political separation of the New World from the Old. "Canadian nationality being a lost cause, the ultimate union of Canada with the United States," he affirms, "appears now to be morally certain."* His opinions on this topic are not popular in Canada. Sir Francis Hincks is not the only writer who opposes them with vigour. I suppose that there is no politician in the Dominion who would dare risk himself before the people with advocacy of annexation.

It has often been asserted that if Canada had been a portion of the unsevered American Union the civil war would not have occurred, so heavily would the votes and military power of the free states have been re-inforced.

The United States rejoice to see the crescent power of the principles of self-government in Canada. They desire for the Dominion a long discipline in self-rule, such as our colonies had here before we separated wholly from the Mother Country. There is no peerage in Canada, and only a shadow of the knighthood exists there. Canada has no State church, although the Romish having yet the benefit of many old arrangements existing before the Treaty of 1763, is substantially a State church in Quebec to this hour.

Let Canada occupy her spacious western provinces; let her open to the sunlight the black furrows of the Saskatchewan Valley; let her carry the farming and forest populations far up the mild shores of that river; let her found in Manitoba manufactures, as well as agriculture; let her bind together her heterogeneous populations, from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the head of Lake Superior; let her fill her forests with the sound of axes and send her huntsmen along her streams toward the North Star, until the gleam of the Bay to which Hudson gave his name comes in sight and the last of the stunted poplars and birches are in view; let her pierce the colossal spikes and bosses of the Rocky Mountains with another Pacific railway, if she thinks it will bear the competition of two and perhaps three American railways south of her. If, by and by, when all or most of these results are accomplished, Canada concludes that she would have a better market with the United States open to her, without any duties on the border; if she shall conclude that parliamentary government in a dependency is likely to be one of faction corruption; if she shall conclude that she would be less open to attack in case of difficulties between England and the United States were she a part of the Union, there is a political party in England that withdrew military oc-

* Smith, Professor Goldwin, "The Political Destiny of Canada," *Fortnightly Review*, 1877.

cupation from Canada and would not risk a war to hold the Dominion within the British Empire. John Bright said in Parliament that Great Britain could be attacked by the United States only in Canada, and that Canada and the Mother Country together could not keep American armies south of the St. Lawrence were the United States disposed to move northward. Let Canada mould her differing provinces into something like homogeneousness ; let her send common schools and open Bibles into Lower Canada ; let her break up the torpor of the lower St. Lawrence populations; let her make herself, in short, a free state with a free church, and the probabilities of her ultimate incorporation with the American Union may not be increased, but certainly they will not be diminished.

I am one of those who believe that the best way for us to acquire power northward is by shedding the light of an honourable political example on the institutions there. You say that the rustle of regal robes yet throws the Canadian people into acclamations. The French are not very enthusiastic; the Irish are not. Of course, politicians, coming to the front with the English population, are full of noise, and God bless them in their blessings of the Queen's daughter. I am ready to join their acclamations, and am not prevented by envy from uniting in them when I remember that these same robes rustle on the other side of the globe, and that an Empress of India is everywhere on the planet, as one might say. The haughty days of England are passing by. In twenty years the United States will have a larger income than the United Kingdom. Who knows but that the ultimate solution of this question of annexation or incorporation may be neither annexation nor incorporation, but the belonging of all English-speaking peoples to one commercial league, self-government the principle in each political division. Let us look far on and anticipate, with acclamation of the deep, thoughtful sort, the time when English-speaking nations shall keep treaties with each other. Let us adhere to what is practical. Having paid the award arbitration has given Canada in a certain fisheries dispute, let us enlarge the influence of arbitration between English-speaking nations; and by that principle form a commercial league sufficient to secure substantial peace for English-speaking populations around the globe.

What I want is not the annexation of Canada and not her incorporation into the American Union. I want a day to come such that, if England ever grows weak after her coal-mines are exhausted, if ever Russia takes possession of the Tigris and the Euphrates and makes English rule difficult or impossible in India, if ever the inevitable approach of age comes to our parents in the British Isles, the shoulders of America may be broad enough to provide, as the eldest son in the family, for the younger children, and for the parents also. Let it come—an American Anglican Alliance.

The Lecture.

Your daughter is not at the looms ; but her grand-daughter may be. Pace thoughtfully to and fro in the city slums, for your descendants may live there. In a republic, without the law of primogeniture or any artificial rank, personal position depends on personal effort. In America the children of Lazarus may rise to the position of Dives, and those of Dives may sink to the level of Lazarus ; and, therefore, in America, neither Lazarus nor Dives can

understand himself until the two have changed eyes. Under republican institutions the interests of the rich man are every man's interests, and the interests of the poor man are every man's also. Such is the mobility of American society that the cause of the working-girl is the cause of the parlour on Fifth Avenue; the cause of the poorest shop-boy is the cause of the millionaire; the cause of the woman behind the whirring wheels of trade, labouring under unspeakable circumstances and bringing into the world offspring tired from birth, is the cause of the most luxurious household that to-day kneels about any family altar on Beacon Street, or of late lifted up thanksgiving in any happy New England home.

I did not see the battle of Gettysburg; but I have seen the rank grass above the graves of those who fell there. I keep on my table a couple of paper-weights brought from what is called the wheat-field at Gettysburg, where men were found killed with the bayonet —a rare occurrence even in a great battle. My most vivid impressions of the carnage at Gettysburg came from the heavy growths I have seen above burial trenches in the meadows and from what I read there on the tombstones. We have all heard how a three-miles front of artillery cannonaded another three miles front, and how the rebel battle line, four miles long, charged on foot across the fruitful plain, and sunk great parts of it into the earth on the passage. Where the graves lie thickest we must take our position, if we would understand what Gettysburg was; and so, if in the carnage—for there is no other word to describe what is taking place—if, in the carnage occurring among young women and middle-aged women along an industrial battle line extending from St. Petersburg to San Francisco, to say nothing of barbaric lines where woman is as yet only an animal, we would understand what the danger is, we must take our position above her graves. We must stand at the trenches where she is buried six deep sometimes. They tell me that after Antietam a great trench was opened in the corn-field, and ruddy youth and stalwart manhood thrown in ten and fifteen deep and covered with earth four feet deep; and that, weeks after, when spectators passed by, the earth was seen to rise and fall every now and then in places, billowing up and down with a bubbling motion under the action of utterly unreportable circumstances beneath the surface. Now, I am no agitator and no alarmist. I cannot open all that festers in manufacturing centres in the Old World and begins to fester in the New, for you would not bear a frank discussion of it; but I can bring you to these industrial burial trenches.

What are some of the rank grasses above the graves? What are

some of the inscriptions on the tombstones of female operative populations?

Then here is a report by Mr. Mundella, introducing Von Plener's history of English factory legislation.* Frenchmen are remarkable for exact military statistics. Napoleon taught them how to keep good tables on the origin and fate of soldiers. France lately drew 10,000 conscripts from ten agricultural departments. The number rejected was 4,000. She drew 10,000 conscripts from ten industrial and factory departments; the number rejected was 9,900. There is an industrial battle-trench, and whoever will put his ear on the ground above what is buried in it will find processes going on beneath the surface that cannot be publicly described. In the department of the Marne and the lower Seine and the Eure —essentially manufacturing districts—against 10,500 adjudged to be fit for service the number rejected was 14,000. If this is what happens to men, with their superior strength, what happens to women and girls, who constitute more than half of the modern operatives in textile factories?

Well, but this is France you say. Facts like these, you think, can be gathered only from Europe. But I hold in my hand a report of your Massachusetts Bureau of Health, and I find in it an able document on the political economy of manufacturing towns, written by Dr. Edward Jarvis, of this commonwealth.

I shall trouble you to listen while I read the inscription on this Massachusetts tombstone. Or, rather, it is not a tombstone. It is only what I saw at Gettysburg again and again—a rude, frail, memorial tablet simply, and the word "unknown" written across it. Who can tell the names of those beneath this burial service? In another generation they may be of your own blood. "In Massachusetts, during the seven years from 1865 to 1871, 72,700," says Dr. Jarvis, "died in their working period. In the fulness of life and the fulness of health they would have opportunity of labouring for themselves, their families, and the public in all three million six hundred thousand years. But the total of their labours amounts only to one million six hundred thousand years, leaving a loss of a million nine hundred thousand years by their premature deaths."

A million nine hundred thousand years of labour lost in Massachusetts between 1865 and 1871 by the premature deaths of 72,000 in their working period! "This was an average annual loss of 276,000 years of service! Thus it appears," continues this official document, "that in Massachusetts—one of the most favoured states

---

*P. 16.

of this country and of the world—those who died within seven years had contributed to the public support less than half, or only 46 per cent. of what is done in the best conditions of life."*

Does the earth rise and fall above this slaughter-trench?

Would you have me suggest what I would have done? There has lately been called into Heaven a brave physician from this city, who dared discuss Sex in Education.† His robe has fallen on many a physician now turning his attention to Sex in Industry.‡ If I must uncover a little of what lies beneath this heaving surface, I shall do so by suggesting swiftly the change I demand; and not I only, but the medical profession at large, the best manufacturers themselves, and, more than all, the natural laws of the Supreme Powers, who are not elective and whose enactments are not likely to be repealed.

Dr. Clarke writes: "There is an establishment in Boston, owned and carried on by a man, in which ten or a dozen girls are constantly employed. Each of them is given and is required to take a vacation of three days every four weeks. It is scarcely necessary to say that their sanitary condition is exceptionally good and that the aggregate total amount of work which the owner obtains is greater than that when persistent attendance and labour are required."

This, in brief, is what I want, and what the medical experts want; what your Board of Health wants, and what I believe the Supreme Powers want and ultimately will have. Until they obtain it these slaughter-trenches are to be filled, not by the agency of Supreme Powers, but by your legislation.

Standing yet at the side of these heaving sods on the wide industrial battle-field, I beg you to follow me along a line of propositions intended to emphasize the seriousness which comes to us as we study the rising and falling of this burial surface.

1. The mortality among girls increases between fourteen and eighteen, and among men between twenty-one and twenty-six.

This is a law for the two sexes wholly aside from any result of their occupations. How strong are your daughters to be when they go into this industrial contest? They are a part of a battle-front extending all the way from the Ural Mountains to the Pacific Seas. It appears that they must march out upon the Gettysburg charge at about the time when their strength is most uncertain. The mortality

---

* Fifth Report of Mass. Board of Health.

† See Prof E. H. Clarke's remarkable monograph on that subject, Boston, 1875, also T. A. Gorton, M.D., "Principles of Mental Hygiene;" Henry Maudsley, M.D., "Sex in Mind and Education."

‡ See Dr. Ames's suggestive work with this title, Boston, 1875.

of young persons of the female sex increases between fourteen and eighteen, when boys are toughest. In the yet sparsely-settled United States you have two hundred thousand girls under fifteen in this battle-front. You have two million females in your industries; and of these two hundred thousand are girls. Most of this number ought to be called children. By a child I mean any one under fourteen; by a young person any one between fourteen and eighteen; by a woman a female over eighteen. Experts of the first rank tell us that a great physiological law is violated in the age at which we admit girls who are children to work behind the looms. There is no prospect that this violated natural law will be repealed. In almost entire disregard of notorious physiological facts, you are sending girls more frequently than boys into many forms of manufactures. You require almost the same amount of physical strain from each, and often pay the girl not more than half of what you pay the boy. Is there any meanness in that? I have an indignation that cannot be expressed when I think of the physical limitations of woman, and of the manner in which she is obliged, when standing alone in the world, to strain all her strength to obtain half a man gets for the same labour.

2. The strength of the female is to that of the male as 16 to 26.

That is Dr. Draper's opinion.* There are various judgments on this point; that is about the average estimate. Woman's muscles contract with less energy and are more easily wearied than those of man. Peculiarity of construction in the bones of the pelvis and chest give rise in woman to characteristic methods of walking and movement of the arm in attempting to throw a stone. We understand perfectly that in the foreground of this charging host the female operative has a strength only as 16 compared with 26 on the part of the male, and that the sickly period, from fourteen to eighteen, is a weight on this small strength; and yet we expect that these weaker soldiers in the industrial army will, in some sense, keep step with the strongest. The natural law violated here is not likely to be repealed.

3. The change of insects from the primary to the perfect or imago state is not a greater one than occurs in both sexes between the ages of twelve and sixteen, but earlier in most cases with the female than the male.

At the side of these burial-trenches you will allow me to mention, although I may not discuss, certain natural laws holy as the fire of Sinai.

---

* "Human Physiology," p. 546.

4. By fixed natural law there exists on the part of woman, as there does not on the part of man, a necessity or need of a periodic rest.

5. On the part of the married woman, it is evident that the laws of health forbid, at certain definite periods, severe mental or physical labour.

6. As those laws of health for the two sexes differ and are not likely to be repealed, it is the wisdom of legislation to make its enactments coincide with those of the Supreme Powers.

And now what would I have?

7. As in France, a council of salubrity, so public discussion in this country, and commissions of inquiry, and advice of experts, and all the light we can obtain from every quarter, and not merely mediæval custom, should determine what employments are suited to women.

8. No woman should be engaged in employment unsuited to her sex and declared to be so by the council of salubrity.

9. No girl under fifteen should be employed in any of the occupations thus permitted to women.

10. Undoubtedly the human race would be the gainer if we did not employ a girl under eighteen in factory labour, unless by special permission from a surgeon.

11. In all employments opened to woman or considered advisable for her she should be permitted a periodic absence, without pecuniary loss.

Thank God that, without my uncovering this slaughter-trench, you understand what is beneath its surface. This proposition has been officially defended by your Massachusetts Labour Bureau, which has made a series of investigations of unequalled value as to the special effects of certain forms of employment on female health. *

12. Additional vacations should be the right of women employed in occupations requiring a high degree of mental and physical exertion.

13. Sanitary supervision of all large factories should be furnished at the expense of the proprietors.

14. You must allow me to say, and to expand the proposition in a subsequent lecture, that in crowded rooms, where conversation is not interrupted by the noise of machinery, there may be a foul or a clean system of factory management; and that the mingling of the sexes, under careless overseers, and the filling of these rooms with profanity, and, possibly, with obscene conversation, from morning to night is not calculated to improve the moral condition of factory operative populations, containing, it may be, in time to come, your daughters and mine.

---

* See Report for 1875, Part II, especially pp. 70, 71, 76, and 111.

15. Married women should not be employed in factories without surgical certificates of fitness for the occupation.

There is a proverb in England to the effect that whoever among the female operatives can manage four looms at once is likely to be wed. "Hoo's a four-loomer, hoo's like to be wed," say the operatives on the banks of those canals in Manchester. I suppose that the concentration of attention required in the women who operate some of our most skilful machines is one source of the breaking down of the female constitution. The physicians tell us that this close mental application at work is exceedingly inimical to female health, especially when the labour must be performed standing. The printer at the case, if a male, stands easily and becomes accustomed to his position; but go into your printing offices and ask whether the sexes are physically equal in the ability to face the compositor's toil. Woman must be seated when she sets type. The general experience is that a woman cannot bear to stand at a machine as long as a man. Even in the school-room, speaking to her pupils, the female teacher does well to be seated most of the time. There are deep reasons, not to be discussed here, for giving a periodic rest to female operatives who must have brain in their finger-tips. She who sets the types the most swiftly, or she who manages the telegraph most skilfully may not need more mental concentration than she who manages four looms and is like to be wed. There must be no mistakes in her physical manipulations. There is penalty at once if a single thread breaks. I have seen at Lawrence and at Lowell machines so perfect that if a single thread is broken out of the multitudinous threads they spin they stop, like sensitive things of life, until the thread is mended. She who is a four-loomer, must have her mind upon every thread, and this ten or twelve hours a day, and day after day.

Perhaps the summer day is hot, and she is at work under the roof. Perhaps the winter day is cold, and she must live in a poisonously vitiated hot atmosphere. Some of our factories are models in their sanitary arrangements; but some are not all. Our first-class manufacturing establishments I believe to be the best in the world. The third-rate ones are as yet, however, the largest class. I am not assailing capitalists and employers as a mass. The third-rate men among the employers are careless, and have necessitated the factory legislation of the Old World and the New. I have on my side constantly in this discussion of socialism and labour reform the best sentiment of the higher class of manufacturers. It may easily happen that this poor woman works in a third-rate establishment. It may be that she is not allowed proper time for her meals. It may be that this intense mental concentration has no periodic rest. It may be

that her own support and that of her family depends upon her steady labour in these unfavourable physical conditions. The result is in seven cases out of ten, that she goes into this industrial slaughter-trench before she is fifty. The certainty is, as I have shown you, that in a multitude of cases, so numerous as to be absolutely terrific, the operative populations pass out of the world by premature deaths.

It is said that for every one that dies prematurely there are two sick most of the time. If you take the records I have read to you on these tombstones of the dead ones who have gone under the sod, and multiply their numbers by two, you will obtain the records of the sick ones who lie on the couches of languishing more or less often. I speak, I think, wholly within bounds when I say that the tossing of this earth above the slaughter-trench is not the whole horror. The tossing of the coverlids on beds of pain is another portion of the evil; but the largest horror of all is the coming into the world of populations not capable of sustaining the burdens likely to be put upon them from the very outset. The rising and falling of the coverlids which are spread over the already sick limbs of unborn generations are what sicken me most. I am horrified by this heaving surface of earth above the trench; I am horrified by these sick-beds; but when I think that the citizen is taxed before he is born, and of what Edmund Burke used to say about the object of government being to make strong men and strong women, and good citizens, and to educate them, and that nothing is worth anything in government unless good men and good women are the result; when I think of the effect of these factory abuses upon factory populations, once become hereditary, I look up to Almighty God, and pray Him in the name of His own most holy laws to fasten our eyes upon the slaughter of the innocents. The aged, you say, are not to be pitied; but even the mediæval baron had pity for his aged and infirm retainers. Middle age, you think, can take care of itself. But what of the unborn, and those that are to come in a long procession into this serried front of the industrial battle-line in ages yet ahead of us?

Where is the old spirit of New England that looked forward and founded institutions for generations not yet visible on the verge of coming time? Webster's eyes were always fastened on the responsibility of the present to the future. Advance, coming generations! was his perpetual salutation to the ages before him. Where are his successors? Where are the men who, looking on the abuses in industrial populations, dare so reform them as to be able to gaze into the face of God and say: Advance, future generations to better con-

ditions than heathendom gave you and to better than the Old World allowed you. Advance to circumstances in which socialism can seem only a nightmare. Advance to such treatment that you shall yourselves be convinced that Dives and Lazarus, God's hand on the shoulder of the one and His hand on the shoulder of the other, have at last in the history of industry been brought face to face, and, to the profit of both, have changed eyes.

WAGES AND CHILDREN'S RIGHTS.

Prelude.—Temperance.

There is a story now in circulation in New York City concerning the younger Tyng, to the effect that his habit of making all the members of his church work is occasionally distasteful to individuals among them. Not long ago a rich gentleman called upon Mr. Tyng in his study and told this valiant servant of reform that he wished to pay his church dues and to have a good pew; but that he did not care to be put down on any committee, and that he was especially averse to having his wife and daughters sent into the slums to visit the poor and degraded. "Yes," said Mr. Tyng, "I see what you want; but you have come to the wrong place. Just around the corner is what you are looking for. There is the Church of the Heavenly Rest." As the slow, fateful experiment of democracy unrolls in the world, it becomes more and more evident that the friends of free institutions cannot safely become members of the Church of the Heavenly Rest on the topic of temperance. It is a cheerful sign of the times that nearly all large temperance efforts in America have of late voluntarily put themselves into full sympathy with aggressive Christianity. Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Murphy, and especially the woman's movement are in substantial accord with the heart of the churches.

1. So far as drunkenness is a vice, it is to be reformed, and the treatment of it belongs to the church.

2. So far as drunkenness is a disease, it is to be cured, and the treatment of it belongs to physicians.

3. But the theory that all or most of habitual drunkenness is a disease is not supported by the best physiological authorities, however loudly it may have been indorsed by the proprietors of inebriate asylums.

The theory that drunkenness is oftener a disease than a vice is going out of fashion among experts. Dr. Bucknill, recently a foremost visitor of lunatics in Great Britain and a Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, has lately made a vehement attack on that theory. Eight or ten years ago inebriate asylums in the United States were held up as models to Great Britain. Mr. Dalrymple, of Parliament, took American testimony, which was supposed to prove that thirty-four per cent. of the patients treated in our inebriate asylums were cured. Dr. Bucknill came to this country in 1875, when the wave of popular excitement concerning inebriate asylums had subsided to a large extent, and his book is intended to discredit the theory that habitual drunkenness is usually a disease. The attack is from the highest authority. This volume, from a great specialist in nervous disease, is a vigorous proclamation of the theory that habitual drunkenness in most cases is a vice to be reformed by moral measures, rather than a disease to be cured. Dr. Bucknill thinks practical Christianity is the best remedy for habitual drunkenness. The Binghamton Inebriate Asylum, at one time quite a prominent figure in the public eye, was not long ago put on trial for a year, and told to its face by the New York legislature that unless it managed its affairs better it would be suspended at the end of that period of probation. Pennsylvania found her inebriate asylum at Media so badly managed that she abolished it. At Ward's

Island, near New York, there was lately abolished an inebriate asylum, at which a prominent physician from the City Hospital, according to Dr. Bucknill's testimony, once found five patients able to offer him a choice of spirits in their own rooms. The asylum was on an island; but the boatmen from New York understood signals from the windows. At Binghamton liquor could be obtained by a half-hour's walk in almost any direction.

Upper Canada, now called Ontario, built a great establishment at Hamilton, with the intention of making it an inebriate asylum; but she has of late abandoned her intention entirely, and given as a reason for doing so the failure of the inebriate asylums in the United States. She has turned now the whole establishment she opened at Hamilton into an asylum for the insane and repealed her statute for the control of inebriates.*

I am not assailing without qualification inebriate asylums, for I believe there is a percentage of cases that should be treated in such establishments; but it is a smaller percentage than the self-interests and avarice of some of the managers of private asylums, both in the United States and Great Britain, have often proclaimed it to be. A real case of insane drunkenness or dipsomania is accompanied by signs which expert physicians can usually read. Periodicity is often one of them; heredity is another; and when both these mark a case drunkenness is no doubt fitly called a disease, rather than a vice.

Seven cases out of ten of habitual drunkenness, however, our best experts tell us are vice, and not disease. If all vehement craving for drink is disease, then a keg of fire-water may convert a group of savages into madmen before they have tasted it. The power of the pledge shows that in most cases drunkenness is a vice, and not a disease. Dr. Bucknill tells the story of an eccentric at Rugby, who promised the school physician that he would not touch drink for a year, although he had been what is called a confirmed drunkard. His case had been supposed to be one of disease; but he kept his pledge and won a wager from the physician. At twelve o'clock, on the ending of the year, he began to drink again, and never ceased till he died.

Very surely is the deep tone of recent science concerning what is called moderate drinking. Dr. Bucknill writes:

"Of late years the upper class of English has become sober, and its growing opinion stamps drunkenness more and more as a disgrace; and that some small proportion of its members are left behind in the shameful indulgence of the old vice is certainly not a matter of national concern. But they will ruin themselves! And why should they not? Their possessions will be better placed in sober hands, and their undeserved social position will be yielded to the advance of more worthy candidates. But they will kill themselves! And this also is more likely than lamentable, especially if they leave no offspring to inherit the curse of their qualities. It would be a national—nay, a world-wide blessing if alcohol were really the active poison which it is so often represented to be; that men who indulge in it might die off quickly. The French have somewhat improved upon pure spirit in this direction by the invention of absinthe, which causes epilepsy; and the Americans, with their vile compounds of raw whiskey taken into empty stomachs, are far ahead of ourselves. An American drunkard who sticks to his work has a much better prospect of finishing it within a reasonably short time than the Englishman."

Sixty years ago Lyman Beecher attended an ordination at which 40 dollars' worth of liquors were drunk by New England ministers. To-day Mrs. Hayes—

---

* Bucknill, Dr. John Charles, "Habitual Drunkenness and Insane Drunkards," London, 1878, pp. 72, 73.

whom may God bless—expels intoxicating beverages from the presidential mansion.

4. So far as drunkenness as a vice leads to drunkenness as a disease, the Church under the modern training of theological students, is likely to know, better than ever before, how to emphasize the truths of science for the warning of the middle-aged and the young.

In 1867 there was founded at Princeton College a professorship for the discussion of the relations between Christianity and Science. In the Princeton Theological Seminary there is a Chair for a similar purpose. There is a professorship, with 10,000 dollars behind it, in Union Theological Seminary for the discussion of the relations of the Bible and Science. The Vedder lectureship in New Brunswick is devoted to similar themes. Willard Parker founded a professorship of hygiene in Union Theological Seminary. At Andover there has just been established a professorship, with 50,000 dollars behind it, to discuss the relations of Science and Christianity. In view of these new endowments, I undertake to say that, unless we, whose duty it is to teach religious truth publicly, inform ourselves on the relations of religion and science, we shall be behind the times fifteen years hence, or twenty, when the men come forward who have been trained in these improved courses of study. The relations of the Church to temperance are therefore, not unimportant on the purely scientific side. Already the demand is growing loud for the introduction into common schools and Sabbath-schools of some instruction on the natural laws of health in their relations to intemperance, and excellent text-books on this topic have been prepared by experts.*

Forbes Winslow, the celebrated English physician for the insane, once told a committee of Parliament that he could dip out of the brain of any habitual drunkard a fluid so full of alcohol that, when put in a spoon and a lamp placed beneath it, the liquid would burn with a blue flame. Perhaps the two most important physical circumstances that can be pointed out in relation to alcohol are that it hardens all the colloid or glue-like substances in the body, and that it has a local affinity for the brain. Alcohol hardens the white of an egg. The brain, and much of the matter in the nervous system, is albuminous in chemical composition, as the white of an egg is; and as alcohol everywhere else hardens colloid substances, so it does in the brain. The blue flame which Forbes Winslow kindled shows the affinity of alcohol for the brain, and should be kept burning as a pillar of fire before tempted men. There is a famous saying of Hyrtl (quoted lately in the *Scientific American*) that he could tell in the dark whether he was dissecting a drunkard's brain or the brain of a temperate man, for the former would be hard under the scalpel. He used to explain to his pupils that the only way to obtain good brains for dissection was to harden them by alcohol, or to get brains that had been hardened before death.

5. So far as drunkenness depends on open temptation to it, the interests of trade and politics require the shutting by law of all public doors to vice; and in furtherance of this work the Church may well put forth its best energies and invoke the aid of woman's vote.

There are eight miles of legalized grog-shops in Boston.† Take the licensed dram-shops of Boston, allow each one twenty feet of front, put them in a line, and you have eight miles of manufactories of mad men and paupers. Has Massachusetts, paying such taxes that her elections often turn on schemes for a reduction

---

* See Dr. Richardson's Cantor Lectures and his Text-Book on Alcohol.

† Report of the Advisory Committee of the Massachusetts Temperance Alliance, October 18th, 1877.

of the burdens of the people, nothing to say about the execution of temperance laws? Eight solid miles engaged in a business at war with every other traffic! When the shrewd black angels watch cities at midnight, it must be that they laugh a little at the merchants engaged in honourable trades, to see how the latter are fleeced by the proprietors of whiskey dens. The indictment to be brought against the liquor traffic, in the name of trade, is that it can succeed only by standing on the ruins of other trades. It is a pirate; it is a leech; it is the enemy of all honest traffic. That citizens in the honourable pursuits of mercantile life are not to a man united against the unlicensed dram-shops in Boston and New York and throughout the world is a puzzle, I think, to the acutest black angels that move to and fro through the midnights of the planet.

Our Church property in the United States, all massed together, is worth only three hundred and fifty-four millions of dollars. The drink Bill of the United States is seven hundred millions of dollars a year. That is an estimate by the National Bureau of Statistics. There is no accurate return even in the Revenue Department.

It has been shown again and again that the financial loss sustained by the sale of drinks amounts, every fifteen years to a value equal to that of the property destroyed in the five years of the Civil War. Every one knows that statements of this kind are facts, and not declamation. A civil war for five years every fifteen years would destroy no more property than the rum traffic!

It is said the Church can do nothing with the gigantic Apollyon of the liquor trade, striding across the whole breadth of the mercantile highway. She cannot if she is the Church of the Heavenly Rest.

The ministry of the United States, without going out of their own houses of worship, have opportunity to reach with the living voice 23,000,000 of people. That is the number of sittings in the churches of the United States, and I suppose that on an average for the year most ministers address as many people as can be brought together in their churches. Probably 23,000,000 who are old enough to go to church are effectively reached by the voice of the pulpit in this land.

What if the Church should be as stern with rich proprietors of property used for dram-shops as the law of Massachusetts is at this hour? When the proprietor of a block of buildings at the North End lets a cellar there, if the tenant violates the temperance laws and is convicted, notice is served on the proprietor, according to the Massachusetts law as it now stands, and he is required, under the old law of common nuisance, to eject that tenant, under penalty. That is what the State requires of the rich proprietor of property. What does the Church of the Heavenly Rest require of that proprietor, if he is a church-member? Why, that he should go on with his heavenly rest and pay his bills in the church! Do you believe that the world is likely to be deeply impressed by our temperance addresses when average church discipline on that point is laxer than the Massachusetts secular law of to-day? I have no church, you say, and can say these things with impunity. If I had a church, and could not say them with impunity, I should not have a church long. I had rather be penniless than a spaniel.

There stands a noble state-house in the cornfields near Springfield, Illinois, and Lincoln's grave lies under its shadow. Above his grave a legislature will be petitioned this winter by ladies of Illinois to give women of legal age the right to vote in cases of local option under temperance laws. The petitioners are not female suffragists. They protest against being called by that name. The queen of lecturesses, Mrs. Livermore, a lady whose eloquence has had a larger public recognition that that of any other woman in ancient or modern times, is President of the Massachusetts Woman's Temperance Union, and informs New England that

the seaboard and the Mississippi Valley are to unite in asking a vote for woman in regard to the temperance laws. The language of the West and that of the East are nearly the same. The Chicago women say: "We petition that by suitable legislation it may be provided that in the State of Illinois the question of licensing at any time, in any locality, the sale of any and all intoxicating drinks including wine and beer, be submitted to and determined by ballot, in which women of lawful age shall be privileged to take part, in the same manner and under only such restrictions as obtain in reference to voting by men on the question of license." The Massachusetts Temperance Union passes this resolution: "That, while we disavow any connection with the general movement for giving the ballot to women, we yet believe that woman should have the right to vote on all questions relating to the legislation on the liquor traffic, and we hereby resolve that we will petition the legislature for this right until it is granted to us."

Let that thunder be heard in the General Court, and heard loudly, for politicians are not likely to take the lead on this subject. After ten years of experience of woman's suffrage, Wyoming Territory, by the voice of three of her governors, proclaims it a success.* In New Hampshire, the line has already been broken as to the exclusion of women from participation in the settlement of questions closely touching the home. Let it be noticed that New Hampshire, a conservative New England State, has just given women the right to vote on all questions concerning the school laws. I am not a woman suffragist. Do not applaud this platform under the mistaken idea that I am a defender of extreme positions as to woman's rights. I am meditating on that theme. But this I dare say, that one of the fragments of self-protection for women—namely, a right to vote concerning temperance laws, when the question of local option is up—I am willing to defend and intend to defend to the end of the chapter. Great natural justice is on the side of such a demand. Woman's interests are among the chief ones concerned. And as to family divisions, why, they come largely from temperance laxness. Woman, surely, has political intelligence enough to understand the difference between license and no license, especially when she has suffered under a lax execution of temperance laws. The difference is so plain between local freedom and no local freedom to sell liquor that woman, without any great participation in the turmoil of politics, might be expected to have an intelligent vote on this subject. I know that many cultivated and refined women say they do not want women to vote, because they do not want to increase the amount of ignorant suffrage. Well, I respect the intelligence and refinement of the ladies who make such remarks; but I believe that on most moral questions woman is likely to be more intelligent and certainly more disinterested than man. I am told by many of the best authorities that women who are opposed to female suffrage at large are usually in favour of this modified measure. I am assured that a majority of the thoughtful, cultivated women of the United States, or certainly of the Northern States, can be expected to favour this demand for a vote to be given to woman in questions of local option concerning temperance laws. If a majority of women want such a vote, Heaven grant their desire! Woman would be united on this topic. Woman's vote would be to city vices depending on intemperance what the lightning is to the oak. God send us that lightning!

On the table of the Chief of Police of Boston there lies a complete catalogue of all the mentionable and unmentionable dens of iniquity in this city. He does not close them, because you do not urge him into the work of doing so. Who is re-

* *Cheyenne Daily Leader*, Nov. 22nd.

sponsible? The hand, or the shoulder and the heart behind the shoulder? On that same table of the Chief of Police there lies now a licence law; and how is it executed? In the County of Suffolk, in the year ending October, 1877, 1,667 cases of violation of the temperance law were brought before the Superior Court. 29 of them were tried; 14 only were convicted; more than 1,100 were laid on file; and the officer through whose oily fingers most of these cases slipped is renounced.*

That law, thus administered, lies on the table of your chief of police. And what lies above it? Why, a proposal for a local option law; and that is weighted down by a veto, although there were cast in favour of such a law the votes of two-thirds of themselves of one political party in your General Court. Massachusetts is Christian; Massachusetts retires to her closet to pray. Can she ask God's blessing on the licence law? Can she ask God's blessing on the catalogue of legalized dens of iniquity? Eight miles of doors, and all the evil their traffic does in Massachusetts exists according to law.

God paralyze my arm if I ever lift it to cast a ballot in favour of the licence of leeches on legitimate trade or for the legalization of manufactories of paupers and mad men! God paralyze my arm if ever I put into the ballot-box a vote in favour of any form of temperance legislation clamorously demanded by the liquor traffic itself! "Drink no wine or strong drink," was the message to the wife of Manoah from an angel whose name was secret and wonderful and of whom the record is that he did wondrously. I undertake to predict, in the words of Henry Wilson, that what the people of Massachusetts, the great masses, cannot pray God for cannot go on the statute-book of this state and stay there.

The Lecture.

The cost of maintaining a hundred thousand paupers in the city of London in 1875 was officially ascertained to be five times as great as that of maintaining a similar number in 1815. The difference arises almost entirely from the fact that the average popular estimate of what is humanly necessary to maintain even the poorest of the poor has risen. In fifty years Great Britain has lifted her estimate on this point so rapidly that she spends five times as much for a given number of paupers now as she did fifteen years after the opening of the century.† American labourers are not expected to live like Chinamen; and Chinamen when they become Americans will not live like citizens of the Celestial Empire. The way to lift the Chinese question out of being a puzzle to our politicians and philanthropists is to change the habits of the Chinese, little by little, into those of American labourers. The progress of democracy has made inapplicable the standards of expense to which low-paid labour was accustomed in barbaric times. I do not discuss skilled labour; but the

* Official report of the Massachusetts Temperance Alliance. See also a speech by Mr. W. F. Spalding, in a hearing given by the Legislative Committee on the Liquor Law, Jan. 30th, 1878.

† Prof. Bonamy Price, "Practical Political Economy," 1878, p. 237.

poorest of the poor. Using the scale of London expenses for paupers to show what necessary expenses must be, you will find that the modern world often exposes children as pitilessly to be crushed under the wheels of trade as the Spartans of old exposed infants on Mount Taygetus.

1. The expenses and earnings of 397 families depending on wages were officially ascertained in Massachusettts in 1874.*

2. So far as can be judged by this large induction, the largest ever made in the world, only thirty-five per cent. of the heads of working-men's families in Massachusetts were able by their individual earnings to supply their families' needs.

3. Sixty-four per cent. rely on the assistance of wives and children.

4. Upon low-paid labour one of the earliest infringements of the rights of children is that they are left at home under poor care while the mothers are in the mills.

5. Another infringement is the lack of household training for girls.

What does this mean? To bring the matter at once to a point, let me cite a letter I received lately from one of the ladies leading in the management of our industrial reformatory schools: "In every report of young women and Christian associations and unions, as in every report of a young girls' home or industrial school, and every intelligence office, thoughtfully conducted, and in every other place in which girls seek employment, the lack of trained skill is the one ceaseless hindrance."

How does this lack arise?

Mr. Mundella, when he moved in Parliament, a few years ago, for a reduction of the hours of labour of married women, said that 160,000 mothers are in the factories of England, and that their children have little opportunity to learn how to conduct household work. The slatternly housekeeping of the daughters of the mothers who must be early and late at the looms is a proverb. Although you say New England has very few of the difficulties Mr. Mundella struck at in his famous Bill against the employment of married women in factories, we are likely to have such difficulties in due time. The present transition state of New England is settling fashions for many years to come, and this audience is an outlook committee for the century next before us. Already we have thrust in our faces the lack of trained skill as the ceaseless hindrance to employment, even in domestic work, of the young women who seek places through our intelligence offices and young women's Christian associations and young girl's homes. My correspondent says:

---

* Labour Bureau Report for 1875. Part IV.

"The city public schools can at their best do but a partial work. The children of the very poor have no homes in which this partial school training is supplemented by training in good personal habits. The girl, if, indeed, any chance to learn by imitation were possible to her in the usual evil neighbourhood of the poorest homes, has not the out-door chance of the boy to learn better things. Many of these little girls who come into our industrial schools cannot set a stitch. How, then, shall they have the economy and neatness in attire essential to the first success in getting work of any sort? These poor little girls are not unknown as patients in hospitals for evil diseases before fifteen years of age."

Silenus and other wild beasts wander yet over Mount Taygetus on which the children are exposed to death! What is the trouble here? The answer is that 64 per cent. of the wage class in Massachusetts rely for the support of their families on the assistance of wives and children. Dull statistics, you say? As part of the family record of your descendants they will not be dull.

6. Of skilled workmen, 56 per cent. get along alone; of salaried overseers, 75 per cent.; of unskilled workmen, only 9 per cent.

7. The skilled workman obtains five per cent. of the money needed to support his family, and the unskilled nineteen from the labour of children under fifteen years of age.

This is not Prussia, nor France, nor Austria, nor England. This is New England, in its early manufacturing career.

8. Children constitute 44 per cent. of the number of work-people, and produce but 24 per cent. of the income.

9. In families which the father is unable to support alone $16\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. of the income is the result of labour of lives and of children under 15 years of age.

10. In order that these wives may remain at home and these children attend schools this $16\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. must be added to the wages of the father.

11. The unnaturally low remuneration of labour is a direct temptation to the violation of the rights of children, by the forcing of them into work when they should be at school, and thus fosters the growth of an ignorant class, which is likely to be also an unemployed, explosive, and perhaps criminal class.

12. The yearly average expenditure for the food of a working man's family is 422 dollars 16 cents.

What are the necessary expenses, not of a Mexican in the tropics, but of a family in the climate of our Northern States; not of a Coolie, but of an American citizen, educating sons to become a part of our popular sovereignty under universal suffrage?

13. If we are not to have an ignorant popular sovereignty, among the necessary expenses of American working men, besides food, we must reckon these dozen articles :—rent, fuel, boots and shoes, clothing, dry goods, taxes, school-books, furniture, tools, newspapers, religion, and sundries, including sickness.

It has been found by official investigation in Massachusetts that the yearly average expenditure for the food of a family of the labouring class is 422 dollars 16 cents. Food includes groceries, meat and fish, and milk. Kerosene oil and lights are reckoned under the head of groceries.

14. These twelve other necessary articles will cost on the average nearly as much as the food.

This deduction is not found in your State Reports, for your overworked Bureau cannot always press out from the rich grapes of its own statistics all the wine of truth they may contain. I have personally gone through the record given here in detail of the expenses of about three hundred families, and I am forced to this conclusion.

15. It follows that, unless the head of a family with children who cannot labour remuneratively is paid about twice as much as the cost of his uncooked food, he is likely to fall into debt.

16. The purchasing power of a day's labour ought to be at least equal to twice the cost of the unprepared food of the labourer. Of course, the price of food may vary, and so may wages. When food costs 422 dollars a year for a family that cannot earn anything except by the work of the head of the household, that family ought to have somewhere about 850 dollars coming to it ; otherwise it will inevitably graduate members unfit to become part of our popular sovereignty. Sound popular sovereignty will not be the result if you shorten in any considerable degree the list of necessities I have mentioned. Get along without school-books? Get along without newspapers? Get along without attendance at church? You say these are not necessaries of life for Chinamen? They are for Americans.

17. The relation of earnings to the cost of living in Massachusetts is now such that the fact stands out plainly that the head of a family who is "the recipient of a wage of less than 600 dollars must get in debt." That is the language of your Bureau,* in summarising its investigation of the average condition of 397 families. Some of these contained only a few children : some had more ; but that was the average.

---

* "Report for 1875," p. 380.

18. Without children's assistance the majority of working men's families would be in poverty or debt.

19. Children under 15 years of age supply by their labour from one-eighth to one-sixth of the total family earnings.

20. Although the average saving is about three per cent. of the earnings, only in a few cases is there evidence of the possibility of acquiring a competence; and in those cases it would be the result of assisted or family labour.

These twenty propositions are the heart of my theme and need much illustration: but I have stated them in tolerably close serial order, so that their interdependence may be seen at a glance.

There is in my hands a letter from a man of affairs in this city, and its topic is low-paid female labour. There is no red-hot gridiron here, otherwise I should like to grill upon it, in a public presence, the man who suggested infamy to a girl as a means of increasing her wages behind a counter. You would like to broil there any man doing that. I suppose the case was a great exception; but I have excellent evidence that there is no exaggeration in what I am about to read to you. This is not an anonymous letter; but the writer, who signs it with his own full name, is recorded in the directory of the city to which he belongs and his occupation mentioned: "A young lady, whose family became reduced in worldly circumstances, felt that she must try to do something for herself, and therefore she applied at a large retail dry goods house for a situation. 'Yes,' said the proprietor, 'we will take you. Your salary will be——,' naming the price. 'Oh! sir,' said she, 'I can't live upon that.' 'I understand you, miss,' was the reply. 'Several of these girl's don't live upon what we pay them. Do you see that young lady there? We pay her just what we offer you. A young man pays her the rest,'" I wish the gridiron were here for the broiling. "I know whereof I affirm," continues this writer, whose letter aroused an indignation I dare not express here, "and I think that when it comes to this the matter goes a step beyond low wages." This is simply an illustration of one effect of low wages. "Please remember that this young woman was not only a person of high character and good family, but also a perfect stranger to this merchant."

If you could see letters that come to me from many quarters, signed and bearing responsible names, you would not think that I am pressing the topic of low-paid labour to extremes. I have taken great pains to avoid being caught in any traps. That letter, before I read it, was shown to three or four experts; and the signature I know to be authentic and the character of the man who wrote it is vouched for in a great variety of ways to me. Let it be granted that

this is an exception; but when an exception like this occurs, when there is a possibility of a class of low-paid girls coming into conditions of this sort, where is Massachusetts? Where is the spirit of the fathers that we do not arouse ourselves to execute legislation like that of the old law of 1670?

Our fathers had not been on this shore fifty years before they passed a law intended to rescue the country from the barbarism of an uneducated working population. The earliest Massachusetts statutes are full of reverence for learning; but here is a passage from an enactment of 1650 that has in it a trumpet-like prophetic tone for our day:

"Forasmuch as the good education of children is of singular behoof and benefit to any commonwealth; and whereas many parents and masters are too indulgent and negligent of their duty in that kind, it is, therefore, ordered by this court and the authority thereof that the select men of every town in the several precincts and quarters where they dwell shall have a vigilant eye over their brethren and neighbours, to see, first, that none of them shall suffer so much barbarism in any of their families as not to endeavour to teach, by themselves or others, their children and apprentices so much learning as may enable them perfectly to read the English tongue and knowledge of the capital laws, upon penalty of twenty shillings for each neglect therein."

Contemporaneous with the incorporation of companies for manufacturing purposes, the General Assembly of Connecticut, in its May Session for 1813, passed laws to secure the elementary instruction of children employed in factories and manufacturing establishments. These early provisions were absorbed into the Connecticut statutes of 1838 and are claimed to be the first American legislation on behalf of factory children.

The deputy State constable of Massachusetts reported in 1875 that there were then "in this commonwealth upward of 60,000 children of school ages, who are growing up in ignorance, contrary to the ancient policy of the State and in open violation of the letter and spirit of existing laws."* If you think these numbers too large for the facts, look forward, and you will soon double the figures, at the rate at which manufacturing centres are increasing in population. These children grow up ignorant because of the low wages, which require fathers to send the children into the mills. They grow up without knowing, if they are girls, how to set a stitch, because their mothers must be behind looms, and because a home left in the care of very young or aged persons is no place in which to teach housekeeping

* "Report on the Schooling and Hours of Labour of Children," by George E. McNeill, Jan. 11th, 1875.

in detail. They grow up slatternly, and so find it difficult to obtain situations. They grow up open at various points to moral temptations, which would not assail them if a higher spirit of self-respect had been fostered by giving the head of the family power to maintain his household.

Advocating no socialistic proposition and defending no communistic dream, I yet believe the day will come when the cost of its production will determine the pay of labour. The cost of production includes the support of a family. We cannot give the State the strength of its citizens on any rule that starves men. We cannot produce a skilled class unless we bring our children up well. Unless we have a certain regard for skill, as well as for the mill, the mill itself will be without skilled operatives. In time there cannot be a fit labouring class provided unless you give such wages as will enable an average head of a family to put among his expenses school-books, newspapers, and religion. There must be somewhere a lifting of the income of the lowest paid class of labourers, otherwise we shall have monstrosity after monstrosity, and the heart of girlhood wrung till the gutters are full of the ruddy slime. My theme is not socialism so much as labour reform, an antidote to socialism. My theme is, in short, justice, as an antidote to the dreams of political heretics. Until justice is held up as a broad shield against the darts of all insane communists and infuriated socialists we shall be pierced again and again with arrows like the poisoned one which I hold in my hand [holding up the letter cited above] and lift aloft for your execration.

INFIDEL ATTACK ON THE FAMILY.

Prelude.—John Ruskin.

[The despatches from England, March 3rd, announcing Ruskin's death, were credited in Boston, and commented on elaborately in an obituary and a leading article in *The Advertiser* on the morning of March 4th.]

John Ruskin is at home and among his kinsfolk. The rough ways of this world, which his feet trod not without offence and laceration, they will never press painfully again. Some of us were his pupils, and we shall be lonelier henceforth; but, although he cannot come back to us, we shall go to him. The Stones of Venice will not see him any more. The Seven Lamps of Architecture which light his present path and our future way belong to a house that hath foundations. Ruskin sustained six characters in this generation: that of an art critic, that of a political economist, that of a philanthropist, that of a master of English prose, that of a prose poet, and lastly that of a philosophical evangelical Christian believer. Except in the department of political economy, you will all grant me, I think, the right to assert that he has done good work.

No doubt flaws can be found even in his best productions; but we are to judge what Ruskin has published as an art critic not by comparing it with absolute perfection, but by contrasting it with what other men have done. Macaulay said that when he compared his history with the seventh book of Thucydides he felt discouraged; but that when he contrasted it with the best work in the same department in his own time, he felt that he had some ground for encouragement. Now who, as an art critic, deserves to be named on the same day with this spirit that is at last with the archangels? According to the belief which was the real inspiration of his life, we must assert that he now has first learned what art is, having entered into the world from which all its prototypes and ideals proceed.

Poor infant, there at Friar's Crag, on Derwentwater, Ruskin gazed through the hollows in the mossy roots over the cliff into the gleaming lake! This was his first memory. The intense joy, mingled with awe, which he had even then in the presence of the works of the Supreme Power followed him through life. He never forgot the palpitation of that first moment of wonder, as his consciousness dawned. Ruskin's delight in nature was such that it would often make him "shiver from head to foot with the joy and fear of it, when, after being some time away from the hills, he first reached the shore of a mountain river, where the brown water circled among the pebbles, or when he saw the first swell of distant land against the sunset, or the first low broken wall covered with mountain moss." He has come to a high broken wall now, and passed through it! He has seen the first swell of a Distant Land against a sunrise! He has reached the shore of a river where crystalline water circles among pebbles cast down from everlasting mountains! Through the tangled roots of his disgust with this world, which he did not approve, although you and I are in it, he is gazing now, we must suppose, if his faith was correct, upon the fair gleaming of a sea before a Throne, from the presence of which, by-and-bye, the heavens and earth which he loved in our present low estate will flee away as unclean! What are the awe and bliss of the new infant in whose experiences the Sea of Glass is substituted for Derwentwater? Let us not doubt that he would gladly inspire us who remain on this

lonely shore with his own reverence for the upper, as well as for the lower range of the works of Omnipotence and Omniscience.

Ruskin's love of beauty was a master passion; and yet, after all, his love of justice seems to me to have been equally intense. His love of truth was so filled with his love of beauty, and his love of beauty so filled with his love of truth, that you hardly know, in his criticisms, whether he speaks more as a prophet or as an artist; whether he speaks more as reverencing the genuineness of the true or more as reverencing the symmetry of the beautiful. Within the range of the faculties needed by an art critic he seems to have been full-orbed. The difference between our haughtiest common places and what he has said on his own theme is that between a truncated cone, a stunted shrub, and your full tree, taking its top and radiance of growth from nearness to the sun.

As a political economist Ruskin, you say, was a failure; but, although assuredly he was not as fully equipped in this department as in the range of art criticism, put his third character with his second, look at him as a philanthropist and political economist together, and who will affirm that any man of letters and art in our day had a more courageous career than Ruskin? He has endeavoured to put into action some things of which Carlyle has only preached. Born to wealth, he has devoted the better part of his fortune to philanthropy. He was no Communist. He was no wild declaimer for the abolition of property. He did talk, as Wordsworth sang, against the introduction of railways and factories into the heart of rural, green England. We think Wordsworth was possessed of more sensitiveness than sense on this subject; perhaps we think the same of Ruskin; but at bottom he meant to protest against the grinding down under the soot of the factory and the railway, and of our "machine and Devil-driven age," to use his own language, the love of beauty, the love of cleanliness, even the sense of self-respect among the poor. We never shall see girls go back to spinning-wheels. We never shall have men using sickles again as reapers on the sunny fields of England; but Ruskin meant well in his St. George Society, and I dare predict that a hundred years from now, when England is more crowded than she is to-day, the memory of his philanthropic motive and the incisive radiance of many a bright gem of political and social suggestion which his questionable discussions of political economy have contained, will gleam far across the years to his credit.

Ruskin was a master of English prose; and he was this because he had a full nature and was obliged to express it. There is a quadruped rhetoric, and there is a biped rhetoric. Of the quadruped rhetoric we have a dismal sufficiency in the world; and when we accustom ourselves to it, year after year, in the newspapers and the average rubbish of circulating libraries, we are apt to think that anything like biped rhetoric, which alone naturally expresses the whole man, is unlawful and unnatural. It depends much on the company a man keeps whether he likes the better quadruped or biped rhetoric. The one is as natural as the other. If he associates with the Jeremy Taylors, with the Miltons, with the Richters, the Carlyles, and the Ruskins, he very soon will come to love an expressive style. The more style expresses the better, especially if its range of expressiveness be in the upper, subtler, moral emotions and the finer æsthetic perceptions. That upper range of perception and emotion does not belong to the soul of a quadruped, nor the expression of it to quadruped rhetoric. If we live principally in that quadruped range, we shall, no doubt, find this loftier biped range unnatural. An orator needs not one style, but twenty styles. The quadruped rhetoric fits certain subjects, and may be learned by a biped who will walk on all fours. But to be kept there!—this is the intolerable bondage—when the theme demands another style. Those born to the brutish style, however, cannot learn the human. It is very un-

natural for a quadruped to stand on two feet, and I suppose the biped human style must for ever seem unnatural to quadruped rhetoricians. Ruskin was a biped, because fully human. Some of his phrases will live as expressing moods of soul that have rarely been uttered in any language. Some of them will live simply from their marvellous picturing power. If I were to attempt the difficult task of selecting a single sentence which seems to me to be the best description he has ever written, it would be the one he has referred to* himself,* and describing the striking of a heavy ocean surge against a tremorless cliff. The sentence is : "One moment a flinty cave ; the next, a marble pillar ; the next, a fading cloud." You say that is rhetoric! Well, it is singularly expressive. But why has not a man, whose soul is not that of the quadruped, a right to utter all there is in it, and to obtain expressions for the loftiest parts of his nature, as well as for the lower ? The truth is that we give too little credit to the really Shakesperian school in the literature which expresses the deeper things of the soul. Richter found it in prose, you say. Carlyle has carried it on. Ruskin has strengthened the foundations of the school. Yes, but it is older than they. It runs back to Milton and Jeremy Taylor and Hooker. It runs back to one who was called Isaiah, some time ago. Back to a certain David who sang psalms which twenty centuries have echoed, or to one whom we call Job, or to another whom we call Homer, quite a long time ago. Under the law of the survival of the fittest, the power of living literature ought to be the justification of its style.

I must call a hush here, for we are standing at Ruskin's grave, to ask for the secret of his power. It seems to me that it was Christian faith. Were I to choose out of all Ruskin's writings the one sentence which reveals the open secret of his suggestiveness, it would be this : "The right hand of Christ first strewed the snow on the Lebanon, and smoothed the slopes of Calvary." Allow yourselves to notice what a belief, such as utters itself in that sentence, does for a man ! Ruskin believes in the Deity of our Lord, and also in the Unity of God. The Hand that was pierced is the Hand that lifted up the hills ; and, therefore, behind all natural law Ruskin saw the soul that wept over Jerusalem and spoke as never man spake. Will you but take his position for a moment ? Will you assume that these propositions represent actual verities, and then say whether the universe does not become a burning bush, every leaf of it aflame with the fire too sacred to be touched ? His marvellous equipment as art critic, his marvellous capacity as a prose poet, all that God gave him inside the range of literary capacity, would have been but the cold summit of the Alps, had it not been irradiated with this vision of the Sun which lies below the horizon of commonplace lives. I must blame even orthodoxy ; I must blame what calls itself, sometimes, scientific Theism, for not attaining the height of Ruskin's outlook, and beholding beneath the horizon the yet unrisen truth of the Divine Omnipresence in natural laws and its transcendency above them all. From the certainty of the Divine Immanence in matter and mind, comes to the loftiest summits of literature, the mysterious glow of the Alpine morning or sunset. Ruskin awes us not from his height so much as from a certain divine colouring, filling all his writings ; and that colouring proceeds from beneath the horizon, and from a philosophical Christian faith. I know what he said about narrow evangelical views ; but he was brought up in them, and to the end of his days he lived in what I suppose to be sound Orthodoxy. If this man did not become dessicated, crippled, and was not brought down from the heights of æsthetic and philosophical speculation by his Christian belief ; if, on

---

* "Frondes Agrestes," section 31.

the other hand, the flinty crags of these intellectual heights were irradiated by that belief, made an inspiration by the colouring which it gives to them, we well may gaze after him into the morning ; we well may look upon his career in this life as but the upstretching aurora of a day into which he now has entered, only to find that what he learned here of the Divine Immanence in matter and mind is true in the least as well as in the highest of God's works. Wherever there is natural law, there God's will acts ; and not only God's will, but our Lord's will, for God is one. Wherever there is a touch of the Holy Spirit upon conscience, there we have the touch of the Supreme Power, as well as the touch of our ascended Lord. In this faith this man lived. In it he swam through the three periods of his life—through that Oxford period in which the "Modern Painters" was preparing ; through those seventeen years in which he was in Venice and other capitals of Europe as a student ; and through the twenty in which, at Cambridge and Oxford, he has acted as professor. Face to face with all the philosophy of our time, this man lived and died, bathed in the light of the Sun behind the sun, and was not ashamed. If the radiance of his writings is seen a thousand years hence, it will be, I think, not because of the gleam of the art criticism, or even of the philosophy ; but because of this overawing light that came from a sun yet below the horizon of commonplace lives.

Carlyle said of Edward Irving : "Adieu, thou first friend, while this confused twilight of existence lasts. May we meet where twilight has become day!" * Carlyle will be lonelier ; but not long. Truly, life is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is to behold the light of the sun ; but sweeter is life beyond life, and yet more pleasant is it to behold the light of the Sun behind the sun.

The Lecture.

The fact has been officially ascertained that in this state the average pay for ten hours' labour by a woman is eighty-two cents. It is the fortune of Massachusetts to have legalized more complete investigation concerning the condition of working-women than any other commonwealth known to history. The statement was lately published in New York that a dozen shirts can be made to-day in that city for thirty-five cents, and the assertion was verified by a letter from a female operative. † My object is not to direct your attention to the upper rank of female labour ; but to those lower grades which you know must exist, if you take as authentic the official statistics. Averages could not be brought down so low were not the lower ranks extensive. It is out of the lowest ranks of low-paid female labour that some of the worst evils of cities arise. If you continue to squeeze the heart of girlhood by low wages, you must expect to find in the gutters of cities a good deal of red, clotted slime ; and if you like to roll in it, remember that you have squeezed out the blood. With eyes open to notorious facts concerning low-paid female labour, I have an indignation at times that would

* Essay on the Death of Irving.

† *Tribune*, December 6th.

not appear sober if it were fairly expressed ; and yet these statistics burn with a hotter fire than I have ever found in my own heart, and I believe that, if you fasten attention on them but for a moment, they will kindle their own fire in yours.

1. These propositions represent the condition of working-women in Massachusetts.

(1.) In 1875 the Massachusetts Labour Bureau received statements of personal earnings and expenses from 15,824 females depending for support upon daily wages.

Many more than 15,000 returns were received ; but the Board struck out of the account all the statements that were in any way imperfect. Over 15,000 good ones remained, complete in every essential particular. I undertake to say the world never saw as many budgets of poor working-girls opened as were examined officially in this commonwealth in 1875.

(2.) The average number of days these working-women were employed in a year was 258.

(3.) Their average earnings were 82 cents a day. They worked on the average more than ten hours a day ; that is, more than sixty hours a week.

(4.) Only one in a hundred owned a house.

(5.) These females were paying on the average 93 dollars a year rent.

(6.) The cost of living of the working-women was reduced on the average to 182·86 dollars a year.

You are not interested in these figures? No ; but they may be family statistics for your descendants !

2. These propositions represent the condition of working-men in Massachusetts :

(1.) In the year 1875 the same Bureau received returns from 55,515 males engaged in the industries of this commonwealth, and depending for their support upon daily wages.

(2.) The average number of the days they were employed in the year was 241.

(3.) Their average earnings were 2·01 dollars a day, against 82 cents for women.

(4.) Only one in a hundred, however, owned a house.

(5.) These males were paying on an average 109 dollars a year as rent.

(6.) The cost of living of the working-men was reduced on the average to 488·96 dollars a year.

Well, now, you say that it is useless to try to frighten an intelligant udience by mere averages ; for, of course, there are a few

poverty-stricken districts even in Massachusetts, and that by putting in the Cape and Nantucket and all the rural districts, and by allowing working-men and women to make their own reports, and by manipulating the figures a little, these startling results can easily be brought out. But here I hold in my hands the official report of your Labour Bureau for 1876, and in it these returns are arranged by counties.* Remember also that your Bureau was honoured by being appointed to the work of taking the decennial census in this commonwealth. In 1875 the labour of the state census and that of the Bureau of Industry were conjoined. There were returns obtained from employers, as well as from working-men and working-women, and here I have before me a table in which the employed and the employers are quoted side by side.† According to returns made by employers for more than 250,000 employés, the average of yearly wages for the state is 413 dollars. According to returns made by the employed, this average is 418 dollars—slightly above the estimate made by the employers themselves. The coincidence of these two estimates is one of the most striking things in this almost mathematically exact work of the honoured chief of your Labour Bureau, Colonel Wright. Each set of these returns were made distinct from the other, and both refer to the same period—the year ending May 1st, 1875.

But I turn now to a few details, to convince you that the averages have not been manipulated. Here, for instance, is grand old Middlesex County, and I find that the average daily wages of woman in 1875—in that favoured tract of Massachusetts—were 82 cents; that the number of days she was employed, on the average, was 270; and that the annual cost of her living was reduced to 178·82 dollars. I turn to Hampshire County, in the middle region of the Connecticut Valley in Massachusetts, and find that the average daily wages of woman was 78 cents. She was employed there 260 days in the year. The cost of living was reduced to 169 dollars. I turn to Hampden County, on the fat meadows of the lower Connecticut Valley in this state, and find woman earning only 90 cents on the average, and employed only 172 days in a year, and the cost of her living reduced to 192 dollars. I turn to Essex County, the north east county of this commonwealth, and find the average daily earnings of woman 89 cents only. She was employed 259 days of the year, and the cost of her living was reduced to 203 dollars. I turn to Berkshire County, on the hills that look into the Hudson Valley, and find woman's average earning 72 cents only. She was employed 266 days, and the cost of living was reduced to 180·82 dollars. I turn to Barnstaple County,

* Pp. 49-64. † P. 10.

which, you say, by being thrown in with the general estimate, reduces the average; and I find that there the daily earnings of woman were 66 cents, that she was employed 204 days, and that the cost of living was 130 dollars. I turn to Suffolk County, and find the average earnings 71 cents, the number of days 298, and the cost of living 184 dollars only.

It is truly astounding to me to find public sentiment slumbering over facts like these, with the additional certainty before it that New England is a factory, and is likely to be so more and more.

The centre of territory in Massachusetts is within the limits of Worcester, on the easterly side, near Lake Quinsigamond. But where is the centre of population? Is it Framingham? Is it Lake Cochituate? The north and south line which cuts the population of Massachusetts in halves passes easterly of a point midway between Harvard University and the West Boston Bridge. The east and west line dividing the population into equal portions passes through the South Boston end of the Federal-street Bridge. The two lines intersect at a point not two miles west of the State House. This, according to State documents, was the centre of population in 1865.* The centralization of wealth is even more remarkable than that of the population. The census everywhere reveals the fact that, through the aid of the wonderful increase of all means of intercommunication, the change which is constantly giving greater and greater power to cities, this added weight of the Atlantic slope of the State is chiefly an effect of the extraordinary growth of the manufacturing centres of eastern Massachusetts. Of these, Boston itself is one. I must be pardoned for considering it a suggestive circumstance that, in spite of the remarkable advances of central and western Massachusetts, the circumscribing line drawn from the State House and containing half the population of the Commonwealth, has contracted its radius ten miles in fifty years. All eastern Massachusetts is a factory. In 1865 more than one-half of the population of Massachusetts, seven-tenths of the personal property, and two-thirds of the real estate were situated within twenty-five miles of the State House at Boston!† In the five years these astonishing estimates were made, Lynn has increased thirty-six per cent. in population, Lawrence thirty-two, Lowell thirty-one, Haverhill nineteen, and Fall River forty.

Here is the incoming of an Atlantic tide. It is the roar of the

---

* Abstract of the census of 1865, with remarks on the same, and supplementary tables, prepared under the direction of Oliver Warner, Secretary of the Commonwealth, p. 274.

† *Ibid.*, p. 275.

industrial conditions of Old England coming into New England. I have lived for months within hearing of the roar of the ocean, and have looked daily upon the coming in of the vast tides. It is little to say that I profess to have lived also within hearing of the roar of the human ocean which beats on the Atlantic slope of New England; and to have looked frequently upon the coming in of these vast tides. Imagine the magnificent coast-line from Newfoundland to New York beaten in all its coves and headlands by incoming Atlantic waves. A feeble occupation this, compared with imagining the same coast beaten as it is in all its coves and headlands, and likely to be beaten more and more furiously as the years pass, by these incoming human tides, and more and more complicated industrial conditions. Not discuss those conditions! Not secure the best life that can be secured for the millions whose future is now being largely determined by the precedents which are to be set in the period of transition New England is passing! Not turn public discussion and legislation early to the solution of problems more vital than any others in the secular life of New England, and sure to become more and more complicated as the tides rise higher! He who says this is likely to be as little regarded as the rattling of rushes before the coming in of an Atlantic surge.

Discussing sex in industry, I have placed in contrast the condition of working-men and that of working-women in the most fortunate commonwealth of the globe, to show you what happens in favourable conditions. What if I were to go to Prussia? What if I were to go to England? My topic touches the whole range of capital and labour from the Ural Mountains to the Pacific Seas, and I am here speaking at a great disadvantage by the use of Massachusetts statistics. I must employ them if I am to speak definitely, for they are the only good statistics of this kind in the world. So has European sentiment—so has even English sentiment slumbered over this topic that to-day you cannot find authority for making statements as definite as these concerning the working-men and women of Prussia and of England. There is now in circulation a memorial to Congress and the President, asking that statistics like these be given us in the next national census, for all the United States: and may God give success to that petition.

3. It is evident from these contracted propositions that unsupported and unmarried women are often so illy paid that with ten hours' labour a day they barely escape starvation, and do not escape illness and debt, and can lay up nothing for marriage or for seasons when employment is not obtainable.

4. In cases where female labour earns 6 dollars, 10 dollars, or

sometimes 15 dollars a week, it is from sixteen to thirty-four weeks of the year only that these wages are earned.

It never will happen to you to forget the distinction between fluctuating and uninterrupted industries if you have had a little experience in seeking employment. A good place obtained is not always kept for a year. Indeed, the uncertainty of employment is one of the things most discouraging to female labour. You know that woman is not man's equal, quite, in pushing her own interests among rough people. She must go about—often alone—and seek occupation. And there is not everywhere a Young Woman's Christian Association to help her into business. Even if such an association exists it cannot always supply what is wanted. A woman—a young woman—a girl—must get her own place often and again; and when she has obtained it, she may be in some fine industry where the fashions change, and where in less than half a year a new set of fashions come in, and the trade has to wait for orders. Many of our great industries can accumulate stock and sell it without great risk. Iron ore is always worth something; cotton cloth does not go out of fashion. But your fine bonnets, your fine embroidery, your ready-made clothing, your finest articles of female apparel change their fashions, and cannot be safely accumulated in advance. They are produced in and they produce the fluctuating industries. If it is your business, as it is mine, to study the political economy of cities, you will fasten attention upon the distinction between the fluctuating and the uninterrupted industries as explaining a large amount of the distress which comes upon female operatives in our great towns. Their business is not steady. When manufacturers tell you that 10 dollars and 15 dollars a week are paid to the best female operative, you must ask how many weeks a year these wages are received. Here I have statistics which show in detail that very considerable sums must be earned in some way outside of factory work, if female operatives in fluctuating trades are to make the year's ends meet. That matter has been investigated in this state. It is fully ascertained that, in most cases, unless these operatives who are thrown out of employment by the lulls in fluctuating industry get something else to do, they cannot support themselves, even at the low average cost of living. If they do not obtain some other employment, they suffer, or fall into debt, and may approach starvation; because in these brisk periods it is impossible to earn enough to keep body and soul together through the whole year.

Let it be understood constantly that I do not assail manufacturers as a class. I am utterly without partisan feeling concerning capital

and labour. But there are establishments in this city where young women are sometimes discharged in a body, and unskilled young women brought in, because they can be had cheaper. Skilled female operatives, who have supported themselves during the time when they were learning a trade, are apt to demand higher wages; but some machines can be run by comparatively unskilled persons. Light work can be done by girls, and it happens in third and fourth-rate factories, even under the shadow of that State House, that skilled girls are dropped because their wages are too high, and unskilled brought in, so that these short seasons are thus further shortened.

Every day there come to me, in my study of this theme, illustrations of the physical limitations of women. You know that in many manufacturing establishments a girl must be on her feet from morning to night. Indeed, in some shops of retail business the female clerks must be on their feet most of the time. It is against the rule to sit down in some establishments. I read in this document lying in that chair,* printed under official authority, of a girl in this city who was kept measuring cotton cloth from morning till night, and at last dropped in a fainting fit. "It was three-quarters of an hour before the girl was able to resume her work, and for this loss of time her employer deducted a quarter of a day's wages."

5. During the acquisition of skill in any trade the working-girl must usually support herself.

6. She is required by public law to be at school until she is fifteen, and is graduated without training in any industrial employment.

7. Developing schools and school shops should be open to girls, as well as boys.

8. But the girl is always less incited by self-interest than the boy to learn a trade, for at marriage she expects, as the boy does not, to make occupation conform to that of the person married.

Flora McFlimsy, who has nothing to wear, is only a little more foolish and criminal than Bridget, if the latter is allowed by her own pride to cast herself upon the world without knowing how to do anything. But it is not the pride of Flora McFlimsy that is chiefly to blame; but our own omission of the proper training of girls to industry.

We take the boy and the girl from the father and mother up to the age of fifteen, and insist that the child shall be at school; and then we give back both so poorly educated that they find little or nothing to do, and, if they were left alone, would not have much to wear. You approved the other day here my proposition when it was

* Report of Labour Bureau for 1871, p. 205.

asserted that school-shops and the developing school are a proper crown for children's rights in the trades. Well now, if they are a proper crown for boys' rights, they are for girls'; and yet I recognize the fact constantly that the girl cannot be helped as much as the boy. She never will be as enthusiastic as a boy in learning a trade, simply because she does not expect to be independent in its practice. Nevertheless, it is a public shame for us to send out of common schools young girls above all manual labour and fit only for the drawing-room, and utterly unskilled in anything that would bring them a dollar. I would have the girl so brought up in school that when she leaves it she may not be above manual occupation, and may not be so unskilled as to be unworthy of employment.

9. Woman has in general more pride of appearance than man, and if in poor dress is less easily than man drawn into the evening-school, the lecture-room, and the church.

Discussing the condition of thousands now in New England, and keeping before you the future prospects of far larger numbers yet to arrive here on the shore of being, I am endeavouring to state in logical order the circumstances which determine the condition of the working-girl and working-woman in manufacturing populations.

10. In the working-room the girl cannot always choose her companions. In the fluctuating industries the door through which operatives are admitted to work-rooms is not a moral sieve.

11. The perils of work-rooms, where unsifted, fluctuating and floating populations are crowded together under careless overseers, will often be great for young men and boys; and especially great for women, young women, and girls, who constitute more than half of average operative populations.

12. A floating is usually a more or less homeless population, and so is less under the influence of family police than a stationary population.

13. Neither boarding-houses nor churches can do as much for a floating as for a resident population.

What do I want? Why, perhaps you will let me assert that if I had a sister I should be very reluctant to put her into a room, say twenty by thirty feet square, filled with floating operatives in a fluctuating trade. Why should I be thus reluctant? Because I have seen repeatedly in this commonwealth three, four, or five young women in a room with fifteen or twenty men, and have had the best reason to know that, as the machinery did not make noise enough to prevent conversation, the effect of profanity and utterly vile talk was

as demoralizing and poisonous as might naturally be expected. If there be an evil girl there, she may do immense harm. If I had a son, I should not like to put him in that room. I have talked with many manufacturers on this theme, and never met a man of the first rank, managing his business in the Christian way, who did not say that this is an evil and can easily be avoided. It can be diminished by securing fair oversight of the rooms. It is not always necessary to mingle the sexes. Perhaps sometimes it must be done; but most manufacturers tell me that there can be a clean system of managing these work-rooms. I know how many exigencies arise in labour, and how you cannot make up what is called a team in certain processes of industry without mingling female and male labour; but in general there may be two sets of work-rooms, and such oversight that this difficulty may be immensely lessened.

When I go to physicians in manufacturing towns, and ask what is the moral effect of careless factory arrangements, I obtain replies that cannot be made public. Go to the best factory physicians in New England, where the floating populations are largest—I am weighing all my words—and they will tell you that some of the perils notorious in seaport towns are likely to arise in every quarter where thousands of people float in and float out, without homes, and are massed face to face in these work-rooms of the factories of the fluctuating trades.

Ominous enough in itself, the historic reputation of congregated labour is yet more ominous from the most important circumstance that many vast branches of manufacturers belong to the fluctuating, rather than to the uninterrupted industries; and must on that account give rise in large towns to large fluctuating populations. The perils of congregated labour in large towns are large enough; but the perils of congregated labour in large towns, with large floating populations have an established name, that makes it impossible to speak too strongly of the worth of family life as a moral police in society.

He who comes home at night to a circle that know him well and watch his daily course has a kind of daily appearance to make before a moral tribunal. The bliss of the home affections is a shield from vice; not only because it is bliss, but because it makes any conduct that needs concealment from the moral tribunal of the most intimate circle as painful as the bliss of ingenuousness and trust is great.

From side to side of the globe every place where a large floating population congregates is found to be a stormy moral coast. In face, of universal experience, I need not pause to prove the moral perils of

homelessness. Those centres in New England where large floating populations gather will always be found to exhibit peculiar moral perils.

All the more to be honoured and trusted for their endurance of the breakers is that percentage of most worthy people to be found in every floating population. Not only am I aware of the existence of hundreds of excellent people in floating populations, but also of the duty of receiving these with especial cordiality to our hearts and homes. But in a large town there is in a floating population not only an intermixture of the thoughtless and giddy and falling; but, further down and most to be feared, a percentage of the thoroughly bad. Men and women who have the worst reasons for leading a floating life need not be many in any floating population to do immense mischief. New England is not so saintly in her cities that she can afford to forget that the exigencies of trade and the wonderful growth of means of intercommunication have brought into some of her inland large towns evils thoroughly analogous to the old and traditional evils of seaports.

14. The proposition I defend is that the working class of the manufacturing centres of New England have a right to ask of the employing class that the moral perils of the work-rooms, under the factory system, shall be made, for themselves and for their children, as few and small as possible.

There is a foul and there is a clean system of work-room management in factories engaged in fluctuating industries and likely to have many changeable operatives. To speak at once to the point, there are work-rooms in which men and women, boys and girls, gathered in large part at random out of a floating population, are sandwiched together like herrings in a box; and, uninterrupted by the noise of machinery, it is not unfrequently tobacco smoke, profanity, and foul talk from morning to night! I am not speaking of cotton factories, nor of establishments in which the noise of machinery prevents free conversation between operatives. But in factories of many other kinds it is notoriously easy for a few foul mouths, not hard to be found in a floating population, to corrupt a whole room. The herring-box system I call a foul system.

Foul mouths in factories are so well known that the expression is almost a proverb. There are numerous and most honourable exceptions, especially in the factories managed on the clean system; but you would think me ill acquainted with the most essential parts of the subject I discuss if I did not refer to what the best class of working men and working-women speak of to me at every street-corner.

I have sometimes seen four or five young women crowded into the same room with twenty-five or thirty men; or three working thus; or two; or one. I do not assert that a majority of mouths are foul in the factories; but I deliberately make myself responsible for the public assertion that a father who wishes the welfare of his daughter cannot be expected to put her into factory life in a large proportion of the work-rooms in the fluctuating trades. There is no saying more common among operatives than that a father does not like to put his daughter or son into many of the factories. The common and permanent opinion as to what the answer would be to the question, Would you put your own daughter into work-rooms managed on such a system? is a test of the character of that system. A management in respect to which the answer to this question is notoriously and always "No," I call a foul system. Perhaps I have put more than a hundred times this question, or its equivalent; and have been answered invariably in exactly these words, or their equivalent: "Before putting my daughter into work-rooms managed on that system I would see her, in some other place, work her fingers to the bone!" This is a terrible condemnation of a system wholly unnecessary in itself; affecting, here and elsewhere, a vast operative population and likely to affect a population larger and larger.

On the other hand, as the example of many of the largest factories abundantly proves, there is a clean system of work-room management in the fluctuating industries. In one of the best factories within a dozen miles of this platform I have seen the sexes in separate rooms everywhere, from basement to roof. Where this arrangement is made, and care is taken to appoint men of irreproachable character to oversee the work-rooms of the men, and women of irreproachable character to oversee the work-rooms of the women, the answer to the test question is different. I have information as to single rooms, in which there is every reason to believe the moral condition is good, because care has been taken as to the moral character of overseers; and as to others, in which there is every reason to believe the moral character is bad, because there has been carelessness as to the moral character of overseers.

When the character of a floating population, the effect of the floating on the resident population, the inflammability of human nature, the immense numbers likely to be affected by the varied influences of the work-room arrangements are kept in view, all that can be said in respect to the foul system is simply that capitalists and manufacturers ought to have sense enough not to adopt it. One hardly feels like offering arguments in the case. It is, however, as a temporary arrangement, though not as a permanent, slightly cheaper

to manage on the careless system than on the careful. There is, too, now and then, a man of theory, or some

"Lily-handed, snow-banded, dilettante"

critic, knowing nothing of manufactures, who, overlooking the immense distinction between the influences of the sexes on each other in the parlours of good society, or in a high school, for example, and their influence on each other in these rooms, filled from a floating population without any careful sifting of character at the doors, judges on general principles, without having examined the case in actual life, that the mingling of these sexes in the work-rooms from morning to night may be an excellent thing. And there are others who, judging from some exceptional instance or instances, where the character of those engaged in particular rooms has been particularly good, and the overseers men of irreproachable character, and the sexes mingled to apparent advantage, think that this is the best *general* rule for the large floating populations of the manufacturing centres of fluctuating trades, present and future, in New England and elsewhere.

It is found by experience that it is in the work-rooms that a young woman coming into the fluctuating trades, and not resisting—as, thank God, hundreds and thousands do resist—the morally unhealthful influences, loses that natural shyness and modesty which are her charm, and gradually acquires a repulsive boldness. Suppose that a young woman falls into both an illy-regulated boarding-house and a room of unhealthful moral conditions in a factory. Which will do the more harm? Which will begin the harm? Where will the first indentation of evil occur? Evidently she can choose her companions to a great extent in the boarding-house; and, if she is of high principle, will choose the best she can. But she cannot choose her company in the work-room. She must there breathe the atmosphere of the company eight or ten hours a day. She may in a large measure choose her own company in the former, except for perhaps an hour a day. Further on in the history of deterioration the illy-regulated boarding-house and the street-school may strip the flesh from the peach; but the down of the peach was brushed away in the work-rooms. This is found to be the history of the case in tracing almost any individual example of deterioration.

The chances in any fluctuating trade in a large town are so extraordinarily great that bad men and bad women will occasionally be found in the work-rooms; and these chances arise from the four circumstances: (1) that the door of entrance to the work-rooms is not and —on account of the number of changeable operatives—is not likely

soon to be made a moral sifting-machine; (2) that the industry is likely to have each year two brisk and often painfully hurried periods and two of comparative inactivity; (3) that the percentage of operatives changeable within the year is large, on account of these fluctuations, and is often estimated to be thirty-three per cent. of the whole number; (4) that, on account of the fluctuations of the industry, the floating population is large, and it is out of this population, itself not sifted, that operatives, in the hurried periods of work, are taken into the work-rooms through a door that is not a sieve.

Already New England has many cities with a population of five or seven or ten thousand swirling in or out of each of them, according as business is at its brisk period or at its lulls. How large will that population be in fifty years? How large in a hundred? I am in New England but for a moment; but I profess to care enough for it to keep fifty and a hundred years of its future in view, and to put at hazard any popularity I may or might have by asking you to meet as men the complicated problems of your vast industries. *Who* is the man and *where* is the man who will say that you can have a tide of ten or fifteen thousand people swirling in and out of a city like this, and no moral perils arise, no sediment be stirred, no grave responsibilities laid upon those whose business is the floodgate through which these tides must mingle with the other tides of the population?

At the best, the filter that you can provide for the tides will be ineffective enough; but to say that there is need of no filter, that you may safely take the chances of careless factory arrangements being continued is to say what time will disprove. If the present careless factory arrangements are continued fifty years, your floating populations in many manufacturing centres will be full of moral ulcers. Lazarus will lie at the gate of Dives in New England, and he will be full of sores. I throw my whole weight into the scale against the continuance of these careless arrangements. *I know that the American Lazarus may to-morrow or in the next generation become a Dives, as the European may not; but, in spite of American Institutions, the day is coming, unless factory life is studied and adjusted most carefully, when here and throughout New England, of which the whole Atlantic slope is a factory, Lazarus will lie at the gate of Dives.*

Why discuss this subject publicly? Because only a powerful public sentiment will correct the evil. In what method will public sentiment aid? It is not difficult to point out the steps. Let it be made socially as unpopular for a man to manage a factory on a careless system and mutilate souls as to manage a railway on a careless system and mutilate bodies. Then the better class of men will

be influenced. Let a majority, thus gradually won, set right fashions, and even the money gripes, and men lower down, will be reached. Business is a regiment. For industrial reasons, men must keep step with each other in it. Let a majority of the board of trade of any city set right business fashions, and the inferior men who care only for money are usually brought sooner or later to respect the step of the regiment.

If inks and silks must be packed together, they ought to travel in separate cases.

15. Under this combination of industrial and moral perils, the working-girl must bear also the perils to health arising from the physical limitations of woman's nature.

16. The statistics of infamy prove that most fallen women have been tempted to their fall by their poverty.

It is impossible to deny that one of the forces which pushes women toward the pit of physical death and also toward that of moral death is low wages. I am not alone in that opinion. It is the opinion of your Labour Bureau. It is the opinion of the best politicians in this state. It is the opinion of the soundest parts of our industrial populations. It is the opinion of many a pastor in a manufacturing town. For evident reasons, these subjects cannot well be discussed in detail in the pulpit without dividing churches. This fact does not prevent preachers from studying them thoroughly, discussing them in private, and wielding all the apparatus of the church fitly to save floating populations. Nothing brings the operative class to church more quickly than some discussion there of their interests. If topics like these are not to be taken up often in the pulpit, they can in many churches, at least, occasionally be discussed there or in public halls. It ought to be shown by the ministry of New England that the great wheel of the factory does not turn the pulpit. The bondage of the pulpit, I believe, is not very great now. We can defend justice and retain our parishes; but the day may come when, unless we defend justice early, we cannot defend it and retain our places or retain united congregations. The expediency of discussing these topics results from the growth of manufacturing populations in New England, and the use demagogues are already swift to make of the accumulating explosive social materials. Both the trenches of death, the moral and the physical, will be filled oftener and oftener unless the topic of wages is discussed sharply, publicly, resolutely, defiantly.

"With fingers weary and worn,
With eyelids heavy and red,
A woman sat in unwomanly rags,
Plying her needle and thread.

Stitch, stitch, stitch,
  Seam and gusset and band,
Band and gusset and seam,
  Till over the buttons I fall asleep,
And sew them on in a dream."

Eighty-two cents a day for female labour in Massachusetts emphasize even these well-known lines of Thomas Hood's:

"Work, work, work,
  And my labour never flags;
And what are its wages? A bed of straw,
  A crust of bread—and rags;
That shattered roof—and this naked floor—
  A table—a broken chair—
And a wall so blank my shadow I thank
  For sometimes falling there!
Stitch, stitch, stitch,
  Would that these tones could reach the rich."

HOOD, *The Song of the Shirt.*

NATURAL AND STARVATION WAGES.

Prelude.—Mormonism.

Place before Mormonism the broad shield of state rights, and very possibly that defence will be vulnerable only by the bayonet. Utah once admitted to the Union will govern herself, and her peculiar institutions will be out of the reach of Congress. Polygamy imitates slavery in seeking to intrench itself behind the fateful bulwarks of state rights. Of course, the clamour is becoming very loud for the admission of Utah, since she now has 130,000 people, and Nevada was admitted with 40,000. That historic political party which denounced slavery and polygamy as twin relics of barbarism, and cut the former of these cancers off the breast of America by the long, deep plunges of the sword through five years of civil war, is no longer in power in Congress. In the exigencies of political strife a time may easily arrive when the prize of two senators and several representatives will induce the dominant party at Washington to admit Utah with polygamy. The agent of that territory is authorized to give the vote of Utah to the party which admits her with her peculiar institutions. Mormonism possessed of state rights and defying American law is the blackest threat in the low, lurid vapour which lies behind Pike's Peak in the sunset. Beyond the Mormon cloud the Chinese question spreads itself across the deepest western sky, as a dull, thunderous, copper haze. So distant, however, are the lightnings that peer fitfully at the East from over the stern shoulders of the Sierras and the Rocky Mountains, that we hear little of the local thunders, and dream that both the black and the copper cloud will dissolve soon, and without storms. In precisely this indifference of ours to these distant threats lie their chief dangers.

Every year it becomes more evident, as Edward Everett Hale has said, that America is to stand or fall according as she does or does not educate the South and South-west. Until the mass of illiteracy is greatly lessened in the Gulf and along the Mexican border, great trouble may arise at any time in the United States from the collision of the uneducated portions with the educated. The deepest shadows on that part of our territory which was once Mexican come from Romanism and a despotic government. The whole region of the lower basin between the Rocky Mountains and the Sierras has been ploughed and sown by Romanism for hundreds of years. Until the stains of slavery, and Mexico, and Mormonism are erased from the American map, the Northern States, with their mismanaged large cities, are not safe. Wendell Phillips says that no thoughtful man can feel sure that one flag will rule this belt of the continent fifty years hence.* The education of the South and the South-west is the remaining measure which the North must execute for the preservation of the peace of the land.

What is Utah worth to the United States? Bend a bow along the Pacific coast, its middle at San Francisco and one of its ends at Yellowstone Park, and the other on the southern hills of New Mexico, and this colossal arc represents a volcanic rift along which are found the best gold and silver mines of America. The Pacific Railway is the arrow, and the Rocky Mountain range is the drawn

* *North American Review*, August, 1876, p. 101.

strand of this bow. San Francisco is the barb of the arrow, and Salt Lake City is the chief feather on the shaft. The string of the bow has twisted among its strands many threads of silver and gold. Utah, in short, has a central position in the most important mining region on the planet. A railroad is to connect Oregon with Mexico through the Basin States. One railway already crosses Utah from sunrise to sunset, and so she is at the intersection of two great ways. Men in Utah, whose judgment is to be respected, affirm that the Southern Pacific Railroad will be drawn into Southern Utah by the value of her coal and lead mines. I am not of that opinion; but I have no right to an opinion at such a distance. My impression is that the silver and gold mines of New Mexico will carry that new railway south of Santa Fé. But the Basin States, of which Utah is the heart, will ultimately have three intersections of the Oregon and Mexico Railway with three Pacific roads. President Tenney, in his breezy, keen volume on the New West, makes that title cover both the Basin and the Mountain States —or Arizona, Nevada, Idaho, Utah, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana. Utah is central in a group of undeveloped commonwealths containing nearly a third of a territory of the United States. The New West is a region apparently set apart by geological circumstances for self-rule. It is certainly destined to exhibit anomalous political and social traits, unless it is pierced with lines of intercommunication from both sunrise and sunset.

What has happened between the Sierras and the Rocky Mountains in territory thus strategic in position?

1. In 1828 an ignorant, indolent, and not reputable young man, named Joseph Smith, began to claim that he was a prophet.

2. In 1830 he announced that he had dug out of a hill in New York State the Book of Mormon; and, although his fellow conspirators, deserting him, denounced this claim as a fraud, he published the Book, and began to collect followers among the ignorant.

3. He and his associates were driven in 1838 from Kirtland, Ohio, where he failed as president of a bank.

4. His debaucheries were denounced by some of his followers, and in 1843 he pretended to receive a revelation in favour of polygamy.

5. Razing to the ground the office of a newspaper which exposed his immoralities, he was shot dead by a mob at Carthage, Ill., in 1844.

6. Expelled from Nauvoo, Ill., in 1844, the Mormons, under Brigham Young, reached Salt Lake in 1848.

7. Originally denounced by the Book of Mormon, polygamy was introduced by Young as an institution in 1852.

8. Notwithstanding the death of Brigham Young in 1877, the hierarchy he founded is successful in carrying forward his work both in its political and its social aspect. There have been more Mormon marriages in Utah in the last two years than ever before in the same length of time. Polygamous marriages are contracted in endowment houses, called temples. These are being erected throughout the territory in large numbers and at great expense. No Gentile is permitted to enter them. Even apostates will not reveal the oaths taken in the Mormon endowment houses, and to maintain contracts made there witnesses and juries perjure themselves.

9. Three or four hundred missionaries are constantly at work abroad, and they induced some two thousand Mormon emigrants to come to this country between April and October in 1878.

10. The Mormons have the balance of power in Idaho, and are acquiring influence rapidly in Arizona and Colorado.

11. It is estimated that there are now 100,000 Mormons in Utah and its vicinity, and 50,000 in other countries.

12. Thus it happens that between the Rocky Mountains and the Sierras there is a district, larger than New England, in which a majority of the population teaches its children that

(1) God has a bodily form.

(2) He is the celestial patron of polygamy.

(3) Jesus was a pattern to His disciples in this respect.

(4) Polygamy on earth gives rank in Heaven.

(5) Mothers, if allowed separate homes, should be responsible for the support of their children.

(6) Mother and daughter may be wives of one husband.

This is the Mormon ulcer, fattening itself on the intermural basin between the Rocky Mountains and the Sierras. Utah is the American Syria. Let the soil have due irrigation, and it needs only to be tickled with the hoe, as the proverb says, in order to laugh into harvests. You say the sage-bush is a mark of desolation ; but irrigate the pastures covered with it and you have bountiful harvests. As in Syria when you irrigate the Jericho Plain you have most vigorous growths, and as on the Plain of Gennesaret there were originally growths reminding one of the vegetation on the borders of the Nile, so to-day irrigation gives extraordinary fruitfulness to the cultivated lands of Utah.

What is the strength of Mormonism ? I find that this cancer has five roots, and the first is the hierarchical organization of the Mormon ecclesiastical power. One in five of the Mormons is a church officer. The highest officer is not only a governor, possessed of nearly absolute power, but also a prophet; and he at any time may receive a revelation reversing all past revelations. If you could smite away the hierarchical organization of Mormonism in its lower ranges, it would still have power as long as the belief of the average Mormon in his prophet should continue. But pulverize that keystone, and you cause the whole arch to tumble. Let the average Mormon be convinced that his prophet is no more in communion with the Unseen Power than any man may be ; let the pretension of the Mormon hierarchy to enlightenment by revelations from on high be once discredited, and Mormonism, so far as it is a system of thought, becomes a heap of nonsense. In smiting at this keystone, we need to use educational weapons. It takes but little education to convince a Mormon that he has been misled by prophets who cover their own sins by pretended revelations.

A second root of Mormonism is its connection with land speculations. Go to Europe, enter the peasant homes of Norway and Sweden, and you will find Mormon agents whispering in the ears of credulous ignorance that Mr. Smith and Mr. Jones, who were once neighbours of the peasants addressed, now have lands in Utah, and that the Mormon Church gave it to them. Pinched men and women are told that if they will go to America and unite with the Mormon Church they shall have land. The emigrant, harassed by poverty, finds that he does acquire property in land in Utah, and that he is indebted for his protection in his home and for his political privileges to the Mormon Church. In his ignorance, it may be years before he ascertains that the Homestead Law of the United States has been behind this Mormon trick. It is understood perfectly well that the Mormon agents abroad promise in their own name what the Government promises to emigrants in the way of land.

A third root of Mormonism is its political self-rule. This root has been fed more than once with blood. Mormonism has been on the borders, and has been able to do as it pleased, because it was out of sight of civilization. I suppose that

the larger part of the stories that have been told us in books of cruelties to the Gentile emigrants into Utah are substantially true. I credit the assertion that the avenging angels among the Mormons meant to keep Gentile emigrants out of the territory, and that they not unfrequently employed murder of unoffending settlers as a political weapon. I believe that if Brigham Young had had his deserts according to law he would have passed into the next world earlier than he did. So far away on the border behind the Rocky Mountains and close under the Sierras, the power of the United States was so weak that Brigham Young once drove out every United States officer from his territory, and then said: "I am and shall be governor until God Almighty says, 'Brigham, you need be governor no longer.'" God Almighty has said that; but the American church and American politics never said it.

A fourth deep root of the Mormon power is ignorance. Go into that Tabernacle in Salt Lake City, and look into the faces of the people, and you will be reminded of what you see in Castle Garden. Go to the end of New York City, and look at the emigrants in the great building there, and you will be reminded of what you see in the Salt Lake City Tabernacle. Mormonism recruits itself from an often illiterate emigrant population, and it forbids any but the most inefficient parochial schools. Mormon leaders have usually been Americans. I do not accuse all the ringleaders of being dishonest. I suppose that some of them are thoroughly sincere; but it would be a miracle if, in a republic as large as ours, there were not eccentrics and fools enough to officer Utah—women, some of them. Thomas Carlyle said there were thirty millions of people in Great Britain, mostly fools. In the United States such is the condition of education that it is no miracle at all that women of the class which sees visions here should see visions in Utah, and that, under religious excitement and the power of custom, some of them should at last crush out the deepest instincts of the feminine nature and appear to be content in a life fit only for beasts. I am speaking very cautiously; I am weighing all my syllables when I say that in Southern Utah mothers and daughters are sometimes wives of one husband. This is the celestial marriage, justified a few days ago by a meeting of women in the Tabernacle in Salt Lake City. This and the things to which it has led—utterly incapable of being described in public—are the ghastly barbarism to which the Gentile ladies of Utah, in a petition to Congress, have lately called national attention. I am speaking in support of their petition. Brigham Young once told an audience in the Salt Lake City Tabernacle that men are not to be required to take care of their children. The most odious and abominable form of the leper's philosophy is that which puts upon the mother the sole care of her offspring. Even our most loathsome cancer-planters commonly clamour for state aid in the support of illegitimate children; but Brigham Young and Mormonism generally stand on the proposition that it is the mother's duty to provide for her family if she is allowed a separate home!

A fifth root of Mormonism is its isolation; and, thank God, the progress of civilization westward is now cutting that root.

Isolation, however, as we have now seen, is not the only root of Mormonism. If we are to remove this cancer from the great intermural basin, we must strike at the other roots—ignorance, the chief one, and political self-rule. I believe Congress is right in keeping out of the Union the twin relic of barbarism. I believe we are not, as an American people, ready to take into the Senate of the United States, as successors to men who have glorified that place, Mormon representatives, with six or twenty wives apiece. We have been sufficiently scandalized by the territorial agent now in Washington and by his four wives.

More than at any other root, however, we need to strike at the ignorance of the

Mormon population. We must treat this territory with a style of Christian charity like that with which we have treated other portions of the West, and with an even more sternly massed Christian front. You cannot carry Christianity into Utah without a much more compact massing of your soldiers than you had when you carried it into Illinois and Ohio. In Utah there is a linked and audacious hierarchy to meet you at every step. In New Mexico you are in the presence of the Jesuits and of a population long steeped in Romanism. There and in Utah you must have schools, as well as churches; you must have the teacher as well as the minister; and you must support both more generously than you did in Iowa or even in Kansas. The conditions are very peculiar in Utah, and we need a peculiar sharpening of our attack; and unless we sharpen the attack and push it boldly Utah will be in the Union with her peculiar institutions, and then God knows whether there may not be need of a civil contest to set the state in order.

What are we to do for the educational institutions now springing up in our Western intermural basin? What have we there already? Why, Colorado College, an institution of which I cannot mention the name without petitions to Almighty Providence for its success! It is not fully on its feet; but is slowly rising to a commanding position, and begins to lift up its hand in blessing over Mormon and Gentile populations. Mexico sees this rising angel, as he stands on the Rocky Mountain ranges. Idaho, Arizona, Nevada, Wyoming, Montana, see him. Mormonism sees him, and trembles in Utah; and so does Jesuitism in New Mexico. This angel, although not yet on his feet, has reached out his hand to Salt Lake City, and planted there an academy; and at Santa Fé has planted another; and from Lowell, in this commonwealth, a professor has gone to Salt Lake Academy. It already has eighty pupils, although that school is not eight months old; and half of these students are Mormons. Presbyterians and Methodists have made an excellent beginning in providing education for the territory. There is an Episcopalian school in Utah, with nine teachers in it who were Mormons. Give the Mormon youth education enough to awaken their human instincts, and they are against the destruction of the home. Polygamy is becoming unpopular with the younger class of Mormon believers. Indeed, if I had had a mother who was only an eighth part of a wife, and had seen her abused under the tyrannies of the Mormon hierarchy, my impression is that I should have ceased to be a Mormon had I been brought up one. The subtle operation of the evil of Mormonism is to disgust the younger population with that institution. If you educate the young Mormon generations, very soon you will be likely to have a new revelation from the head of the Mormon hierarchy, and it will be against polygamy.

Let us so support these schools that they will take no craven or apologetic attitude before either Romanism or Mormonism. Let us pour funds into the treasury of Colorado College, and Salt Lake Academy, and Santa Fé Academy, and other similar institutions in Utah and New Mexico.

The Mormon problem I, for one, do not expect to see settled unless by the school or by the sword. The choice is between the keen edge of the sword and the keen edge of the Christian school. God give us such wisdom that He may not need to send the sword to cut at last the Mormon cancer out of our sunset shoulder!

The Lecture.

One of the earls of Warwick Castle, a king-maker, was killed in a civil broil; and the fierce old feudal spirit caused his body to be exposed

naked for three days on the floor of St. Paul's in London. Rough as his age was, an earl of Kenilworth Castle founded on his great estate an establishment for the aged soldiers who had been with him in his wars. Feudalism once was so cruel that the baron had the right to kill two peasants in order to warm his feet in their blood; but this cannibalism grew so soft at last, even in the dark middle ages, that it became social degradation to neglect the aged, to snatch out of life the strength of youth and manhood, and then leave advanced years to shift for themselves. The hereditary, territorial, feudal aristocracy thought itself bound by interest, or, at least, by custom, to take care of age; and it fixed the mark of social infamy upon any leader who did not protect those who had followed him in their manhood. Feudalism has vanished out of Europe. It has never planted its hoof on American soil; or, at least, if it hovered for a while over this continent, the impact of its split feet was so light that the tracery of the imprint is now almost removed. De Tocqueville ventures to affirm that the modern manufacturing aristocracy, which to a large extent has taken the place of the hereditary and territorial, differs from the old feudal aristocracy in that it feels no responsibility for the age of its dependants. Give us the best service of youth; crush out, if you please, the right of the children to a fair education in primary branches; give us the strength of the girl before her strength has as yet been fully confirmed; give us the strength of the mothers when their strength should be used in their households; give us the strength of manhood up to the last hour in which it can labour remuneratively, and then let the ruined girl, let the mother in her weakness, let old age in its dependence, shift for themselves. This is a terrific indictment against the modern system of wages, which I do not attack, but which many do. If I put before you in outline some of the reasons why that system is attacked, you will have patience with me, perhaps, while I go on to claim that natural wages must, at the least, be twice the cost of the unprepared food of the labourer. I have age in mind; I have children's rights in mind; I have mother's rights in mind. I have American standards of living and universal suffrage in mind. I arrive at the conclusion that justice is not dangerous to capital. As in the old feudal aristocracy justice was the glory of the order, so in the new aristocracy justice is the glory of wealth and power. As in the old aristocracy infamy was inflicted on any leader who neglected the interests of age, when the strength of manhood had served him; so in the new aristocracy, more cruel than the old, social infamy ought to be imprinted on any legislation and on any leader of politics or of manufactures

that neglects the interests of age, when manhood has given its best strength to that leader.

1. The cost of producing labour should determine the price of labour.

2. The cost of producing labour includes that of rearing a family.

3. The cost of rearing a family depends on the standard of comfort and decency, below which labourers will not go or ought not to go.

I recognise the distinction between the two standards. What ought to be is what in America must be, if our institutions are to endure under universal suffrage.

4. In a republic under universal suffrage the cost of living ought to include the expense of educating children in the common schools up to fifteen years of age.

5. It ought to include the expense of keeping wives at home, to take charge of little children.

6. It ought to include a fair support for old age, in case temperance, industry and economy have marked the habits of the labourer.

I make no plea for dissipation. The slovenly spendthrift, the drunkard ought to suffer. Shiftlessness deserves the workhouse in nine cases out of ten.

7. It will be found that wages less than twice the cost of the unprepared food of the labourer will not meet the demands of the American standard of living.

8. Under wages by any considerable degree lower than this standard requires, it is found that American populations of native birth do not increase fast enough to make up for the inevitable and incessant loss of labour from death and disability.

9. As a means of preventing such a multiplication of population as shall make the supply of labour greater than the demand, it is politically and industrially prudent to build up in popular estimation a high and advancing standard of living.

10. There should be no interference by law with the rate of wages for adult males; but public discussion and working men's organizations are to be encouraged in the demand for natural wages.

11. Natural wages would prevent the formation of an ignorant class.

12. They would diminish the size of the unemployed, discontented, and explosive class.

13. They would destroy the power of demagogues.

14. They would increase the expenses of the working classes.

15. They would increase the gains of capitalists.

16. By removing the chief perils of universal suffrage, and giving justice free course in the relations of capital and labour, natural

wages would make America an organizing and redemptive political example to the world, and nothing else will.

It will be noticed that in these propositions I am defining natural wages under the American standard of living, and not necessary wages under the Japanese or the Chinese scale of expenses. The definition given in these propositions accords, however, with the best authorities. In his superb work on "The Wages Question"* you will find Professor Walker, of Yale College, maintaining that "the whole significance of the term 'necessary wages' is that, in order to the supply of labour being maintained, wages must be paid which will not only enable the labouring class to subsist according to the standard of comfort and decency, or of discomfort and indecency, it may be, which they set up for themselves as that below which they will not go; but will also dispose them to propagate sufficiently to make up the inevitable incessant loss from death or disability."

Your Labour Bureau affirms† that "it seems natural and just that a man's labour should be worth and that his wages should be as much as, with economy and prudence, will comfortably maintain himself and family, enable him to educate his children, and also to lay by enough for his decent support when his labouring powers have failed."‡

Dr. Engel, of Berlin, has shown that in Prussia a person with an income of 750 dollars a year spends 50 per cent. of this sum for food alone.‖

It was my fortune to maintain on this platform, more than a year ago,¶ that food unprepared costs about half as much as the other necessary expenses of a family living according to the American standard. I suppose I do not carry the assent of this audience when I take my stand on that proposition; and, therefore, I shall this morning occupy at least ten minutes in a dry analytical discussion in proof of that one assertion. You accuse this platform of using rhetoric; but if, when delivering a statistical lecture, I am exceedingly dry and cool, you say the discussion is low and ordinary. Now I wish it to be lower and more ordinary than ever for a few minutes.

Here is the official report of your Bureau of Labour for 1875, and it contains a list of the replies made by 397 families in this commonwealth in 1874 to questions concerning their earnings and expenses. The replies were not received merely in answer to circulars; but

---

* P. 112.

† "Report for 1875," p. 445.

‡ See also Professor Bonamy Price, "Practical Political Economy," p. 225.

‖ See Walker, "The Wages Question," p. 117.

¶ Boston Monday Lectures on Conscience, Preludes 1 and 2.

your agents went into manufacturing towns of this state, buttonholed working men, went home with them after their hours of labour were over, gave the respondents opportunity to consult their note-books, and so obtained answers to questions on a great variety of points concerning earnings and expenses of the class depending on wages. No commonwealth in history has gathered social statistics as carefully as has Massachusetts. I know that prices were higher in 1874 than they now are; and so, possibly, 422 dollars is too large a figure for the unprepared food of a family to-day. But the relation between the price of food and the price of other articles, the relation between the cost of living and the purchasing power of a day's labour, have not very greatly changed. It is the proportion to which I call attention, rather than to the figures on any one point. My topic is the lowest paid labour; but I accept a disadvantage in the argument by occasionally quoting examples from the ranks of skilled labour. I put before you the expenses and earnings of families out of several different trades in this commonwealth; and, if you doubt the record in any case, you can go to the Labour Bureau, take the number of the record here, and find the signature of the head of the family. Every record here is paralleled with written records in the Bureau at 33, Pemberton Square, in this city, and can be verified legally, if you please, by sufficient trouble being expended upon the case. I regard the present conduct of the Bureau as utterly unpartisan. It is as cool as the multiplication table and as unanswerable.

No. 1. BRICKLAYER. *German.*

Earnings of Father $810

CONDITION.—Family numbers five—parents and three children, from eight months to seven years of age; one goes to school. Occupy a tenement of four rooms, well located with good surroundings. The house is well furnished and the parlour carpeted. Own a piano. Family dresses well.

FOOD :—

Breakfast.—Bread, butter, meat, and coffee.
Dinner.—Meat or fish, potatoes, bread, pie.
Supper.—Bread, butter, gingerbread, tea.

Cost of Living	$810		
Rent	$204 00	Boots and Shoes	$30 50
Fuel...	49 60	Clothing...	42 00
Groceries	320 49	Dry Goods	24 00
Meat	81 22	Papers	8 00
Fish...	9 60	Societies	10 00
Milk	18 00	Sundries	12 59

Here groceries, meat, fish, and milk, as you notice, cost 428 dollars, or slightly more than half of 810 dollars, the total cost of living.

No. 3. CARPENTER. *American.*

Earnings of Father $686

CONDITION.—Family numbers four—parents and two children, from one to five years of age. One goes to school. Live in a tenement of five rooms, pleasantly located and surrounded. The apartments are well furnished and carpeted. Have a sewing-machine. Family dresses well and attends church.

FOOD :—

Breakfast.—Bread, butter, meat, eggs, cake, and coffee.
Dinner.—Bread, butter, meat, potatoes, vegetables in season, pie, and tea.
Supper.—Bread, butter, cake, sauce, and tea.

Cost of Living	$686		
Rent	$100 00	Boots and Shoes	$27 00
Fuel...	43 80	Clothing	84 00
Groceries	208 19	Dry Goods	24 00
Meat...	101 14	Papers	9 00
Fish...	8 00	Religion	12 00
Milk...	28 40	Sundries	40 00

In this case the food of the family costs 345 dollars, or almost precisely half the whole cost of living.

No. 58. BOOTMAKER. *American.*

Earnings of Father $660

CONDITION.—Family numbers five—parents and three children, from two to nine years of age. Two go to school. Occupy a tenement of five rooms in a healthy locality, with good surroundings. House is well furnished, with the parlour carpeted. Have a sewing-machine. Family dresses well. Had sickness in family last year, which was the cause of their running into debt.

FOOD :—

Breakfast.—Bread and butter, meat or eggs, cake, coffee.
Dinner.—Brown bread and butter, meat and potatoes, vegetables, pickles, pie, and tea.
Supper.—Bread and butter, sauce, cake, tea.

Cost of Living	$712 50		
Rent	$120 00	Boots and Shoes	$10 00
Fuel...	42 75	Clothing	47 00
Groceries	319 29	Dry Goods	20 00
Meat	82 00	Sundries, including Doctor's Bill	55 50
Milk...	15 46		

Notice that the food here costs 416 dollars, or more than half the total earnings of the father, and that the family, in consequence, has fallen into debt on account of a little sickness.

No. 77. SHOEMAKER. *American.*

Earnings of Father	$480
Earnings of Son, aged 16	230
Earnings of Son, aged 14	180
	—$890

CONDITION.—Family numbers five—parents and three children. One goes to school all the time and the other when business is dull. Father intends to let them have three months' schooling every year. Have a nice tenement of six rooms, about ten minutes' walk from the shop, in a good neighbourhood and healthy locality. The house is well furnished and parlour carpeted. Have a sewing and other labour-saving machines. Family dresses well. The father worked eight months last year and earned from 12 dollars to 17 dollars per week. He hoped that the Bureau would correct a false statement that had been published in several papers, that shoemakers averaged 18 dollars per week, as such a correction was needed.

FOOD :—

Breakfast.—Hot biscuit, bread, butter, fried ham or eggs or cheese, cake and coffee.

Dinner.—Bread, butter, beef, mutton or fresh pork, potatoes, vegetables, pudding or pie, and tea.

Supper.—Bread, butter, cheese, cake, meat, if any left from dinner, and tea. Baked beans on Sunday and fish one day in the week.

Cost of Living	$822 15		
Rent...	$200 00	Clothing	$68 00
Fuel...	48 50	Dry Goods	18 00
Groceries	364 90	Boots and Shoes	17 00
Meat and Fish	70 75	Sundries	20 00
Milk	15 00		

Here is a son, fourteen years old, earning 180 dollars. There is a great temptation in that family to keep this son out of school. It is said that in Switzerland it costs ten pounds a year to keep out of school a child between twelve and fourteen years of age. The Swiss law requires that children should be in school, and poor families lose a considerable sum by obeying the law. In Massachusetts the law requires children to be in school up to a certain age; and this family, for instance, would lose 180 dollars by keeping that son under fifteen at school all the while. But, if you take out the earnings of that son, this family will fall into debt. Which shall it do, send the son to school or incur debt?

When we think how demagogues obtain votes out of an explosive and ignorant population to-day, we need look forward no further than 1880, and the possible Presidential issues, to prove that there is timeliness in every topic of this kind.

President Woolsey has just begun in the *New York Independent* a discussion of socialism. There are signs all around the horizon that this topic must come up. Professor Hitchcock of New York has just published on socialism a book fit to take the rank of a classic in the literature on this topic. The other night in Brooklyn Dr. Storrs's church was packed to the roof to hear discussions by Professor Hitchcock and Dr. Storrs on this theme. The *Atlantic Monthly* opens its

pages to this topic. Congress appoints investigating committees concerning it.

Having in mind the possible issues in the Presidential conflict of 1880, you will pardon me if I try to dampen the powder demagogues would explode.

No. 80. SHOEMAKER. *American.*

Earnings of Father $552

CONDITION.—Family numbers six—parents and four children, from two to sixteen years of age. The two elder go to school. Have a tenement of six rooms, situated in a pleasant neighbourhood. The rooms are well furnished and carpeted, and the house kept clean and orderly. Family dresses respectably and well, and attends church. On account of the shoe business being very dull for the past two years, the family has had a hard struggle to pay bills; and during the last year has run behind some $70, as there was work only eight months and a half. Had a little money in the savings bank; but was obliged to use it. The oldest child will begin work at the close of the present school-term. This family is very economical. Had no sickness; bought a few clothes.

FOOD:—

Breakfast.—Bread, butter, hash, or potatoes warmed from the day before, doughnuts or cake, coffee.

Dinner.—Meat, potatoes, pie or pudding, and tea.

Supper.—Bread, butter, sauce or cheese, cake, and tea. Buckwheat or griddle-cakes occasionally for breakfast. Baked beans on Saturday night and Sunday morning.

Cost of Living	$622		
Rent	$200 00	Boots and Shoes	$16 00
Fuel...	36 50	Clothing and Dry Goods ...	28 50
Groceries	260 00	Sundries, taxes, &c.	11 00
Meat	52 00		
Milk...	18 00		

Here is a debt, and how shall it be paid? The expense for food is, as usual, about half the cost of living.

No. 86. SHOEMAKER. *American.*

Earnings of Father	$546
Earnings of Son, aged 14	192
	——$738

CONDITION.—The family numbers four—parents and two children, from ten to fourteen years of age. One goes to school. Live in a tenement of five rooms, in a good locality, with pleasant surroundings. The apartments are well furnished, carpeted, and kept very clean. Family dresses well. With the assistance of the son, can make enough to support family. Work about nine months in the year. Impossible to save money.

FOOD:—

Breakfast.—Bread, butter, meat or eggs, cake, coffee.

Dinner.—Bread, butter, meat, potatoes, vegetables, pie, and tea.

Supper.—Bread, butter, sauce or fruit, cheese, cake, tea.

Cost of Living			$738
Rent	$120 00	Boots and Shoes	$12 00
Fuel...	49 50	Clothing	91 00
Groceries	216 33	Dry Goods	27 50
Meat...	99 62	Books and Papers	12 00
Fish...	10 40	Societies...	8 00
Milk...	17 60	Sundries...	74 05

Mr. Senior * says that "when a Scotchman rises from the lowest to the middling classes of society shoes become to him necessaries. He wears them to preserve not his feet, but his station in life." All Americans wear shoes to preserve not their feet only, but their social position.

No. 97. SHOEMAKER. *French.*

Earnings of Father $396

CONDITION.—Family numbers six—parents and four children, from one to nine years of age. Two go to school. Live in a crowded tenement of three rooms, situated in a very unhealthy locality, in the midst of filth and pollution. On outside of building is a sink-conductor, badly out of repair, and the sink-water, almost black, runs down the clapboards, causing an offensive stench, which can be smelt at a great distance. The inside of house is on a par with the surroundings. It is poorly furnished and seems the abode of poverty. Children pale-looking, sickly and wretchedly kept. Father earns from 12 dollars to 15 dollars per week, when he has work; but, on account of sickness and dulness of trade, finds it impossible to keep out of debt and live. Sees no hope of betterment of condition until children are old enough to work. Family dresses miserably.

FOOD :—

Breakfast.—Bread, butter, sometimes salt fish or pork, coffee.

Dinner.—Bread, meat three days per week, salt fish or pork the remainder, potatoes, sometimes pie, water.

Supper.—Bread, sometimes brown bread or oatmeal bread, butter, tea, occasionally ginger-bread. Cannot afford luxuries.

Cost of Living			$483 40
Rent	$96 00	Milk...	$12 00
Fuel...	30 50	Clothing, Shoes, and Dry Goods	28 50
Groceries	244 90	Sickness	19 00
Meat	23 00	Sundries	11 50
Fish...	18 00		

I had occasion to advise a most delicate lady the other day in respect to her visits among the degraded, and told her that ministers usually took a hearty meal before they go into desolate quarters. It is not always safe to visit the fever-dens and death traps in this little city of Boston in the summer. You had better go when the snow is on the ground. A preacher once told me that at a funeral in the

* "Political Economy," pp. 36, 37.

slums he always took the precaution to stand between the door and the bed on which the corpse lay. Circumstances of this kind are, of course, out of sight of the board of health.

No. 215.	Labourer in Mill.	*English.*
Earnings of Father		$370
Earnings of Daughter, aged 15...		249
		——$619

Condition.—Family numbers five—parents and three children, from eight to fifteen years of age. Two go to school. Occupy a tenement of four rooms, with good and pleasant surroundings. House is moderately well furnished. Family dresses well.

Food :—

Breakfast.—Bread, butter, sometimes eggs or what was left from dinner, coffee.
Dinner.—Meat, potatoes, vegetables in season, bread, pie.
Supper.—Bread, butter, sometimes cheese, cake, tea.

Cost of Living	$619		
Rent	$66 00	Boots and Shoes	$14 00
Fuel...	39 50	Clothing...	37 50
Groceries	308 50	Dry Goods	17 00
Meat	85 90	Papers	8 00
Milk	11 26	Sundries	30 34

Even with the help of the daughter, nothing can be laid up here for sickness or age.

No. 346.	Labourer on Streets.	*Irish.*
Earnings of Father		$436
Earnings of Wife		200
		——$636

Condition.—Family numbers six—parents and four children, from two to thirteen years of age. Two go to school. Have a tenement of three rooms in a poor locality. The house is meanly furnished and dirty. The mother goes out cleaning and washing; therefore has no time to keep her own house clean. Family dresses poorly.

Food :—

Breakfast.—Bread, butter, and coffee.
Dinner.—Meat or fish, potatoes and bread.
Supper.—Bread, butter, and tea.

667 $351 $667

Cost of Living	$351		
Rent	$126 00	Milk	$17 20
Fuel...	30 25	Boots and Shoes	12 00
Groceries..	376 25	Clothing...	21 80
Meat	50 40	Dry Goods	14 00
Fish...	4 29	Sundries...	9 30

661 49

No. 306.	Labourer out-door.	*Irish.*
Earnings of Father		$351

Condition.—Family numbers five—parents and three children, from two to

seven years of age. Have a tenement of three rooms in a large tenement-block, in which is an average of two and a half persons to each room. It is situated in a very unhealthy neighbourhood. The father works only about nine months in the year and the mother goes out washing. A part of the fuel is picked from the streets by the children who do not attend school. This family is a little over 50 dollars in debt. It took more than the mother could earn to buy the clothes, and, as there was some sickness, it ran them in debt a little for physician and medicine. Family dresses poorly.

Food:—

As to how they lived, they could not tell, as it varied according to their means. They have meat only two days per week.

Cost of Living	$362		
Rent	$166 00	Milk...	$13 60
Fuel...	23 00	Fish...	18 00
Groceries	201 80	Boots and Shoes	14 25
Meat	24 25	Poll Tax...	2 00

This case is too sad for comment; but it is a most just type of low-paid labour.

Natural wages are such as will reproduce labour.

The true definition of value is not the cost of production, but the cost of reproduction.

What is Tremont Temple worth to-day? Any good salesman will tell you that its value is not measured by what it cost, but by what it would cost to reproduce it. Timber and other building material may have been cheaper when this Temple was erected than they are now. Its value is the cost of its reproduction. As in regard to any other piece of property, so with regard to that piece of property which we call labour, there must be enough paid for it to cover the cost not only of producing it, but of reproducing it under the new circumstances of the time. This is a natural law, not likely to be reversed. When wages go below a certain point the increase of population is so diminished in many cases that you cannot fill up the gaps caused by death and disability. That is, you cannot reproduce the labour.

My feeling is that as long as the explosive class is in the process of growth at the bottom of society we shall have demagogues who will abuse universal suffrage. My conviction is that American institutions cannot safely permit the formation of a hereditary poor class. Cripples may drop down; but if men who are not intemperate and who are economical and industrious find that a little sickness throws them into debt and that they cannot lay up anything for advanced years, there will be an explosive class, and demagogues will employ it. There will be an unemployed and a discontented class, and politicians of the fifth rank will ride on the explosions of that portion of society

into power. If we had the rule adopted—not by legislation, but by general custom—that when a man is willing to work he shall be paid enough to make the purchasing power of a day's labour equal to twice the cost of his unprepared food, or to twice the cost of the unprepared food for a family that cannot labour remuneratively, how could this powder explode? How could the powder ever itself be produced? I hold that natural wages would increase the gains of capitalists, by increasing the expenditures of the labouring class. I have in mind a time when America, by justice to labour, will give renewed strength to capital, and make the industrial arrangements of the United States a model for other nations. Only the Golden Rule can bring the Golden Age.

"Methinks I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks. Methinks I see her as an eagle mewing her mighty youth, and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full mid-day beam, purging and unsealing her long-abused sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance, while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about amazed at what she means." *

---

* Milton, "*Areopagitica.*"

IS JUSTICE A PERIL TO CAPITALISTS?

Prelude.—Resumption of Specie Payments.

Resumption of specie payments by the United States begins with the new year, and what, according to many popular prophets, ought not to be and could be already is. You take up your newspaper and read: "Gold stands steady at par." That is news you have not seen for seventeen years. It is great news. America kneels on the frosty sods above the tombs of the martyrs in the civil war and, thirteen years only after the close of a conflict five years in duration, she lifts up her hands to Heaven and receives as a New Year's present a clean financial record. This gift comes from God, and not from seventh-rate politicians.

Surely a republic in which universal suffrage is sometimes said to be a failure has a right to point with abundant gratitude to Providence and some honest pride to a financial record unexampled in ancient or modern times. In 1860 the public debt of the United States was sixty-four millions of dollars. In 1866 it was two thousand seven hundred and seventy-three millions. In 1877 it was two thousand and sixty millions. The public debt of Great Britain and Ireland is three thousand six hundred and twenty-five millions of dollars. Before our civil war we knew little or nothing of internal taxation for federal purposes. During that conflict that taxation was raised above every present and every past example. The interest on our debt was the highest in the world. After the close of the Napoleonic wars the propertied classes in Great Britain refused to bear an income tax for a single year. Americans have long borne voluntarily under universal suffrage the burdens of war taxation. In 1877 we exported so much more merchandise than we imported that the balance of trade in our favour was one hundred and fifty-two millions of dollars. The United States have reduced their national debt eight fold more rapidly than Great Britain did hers.

"In each twelve months," says Mr. Gladstone, "America has done what we did in eight years; her self-command, self-denial, and wise forethought for the future have been, to say the least, eightfold ours. An enfranchised nation tolerated burdens which in Great Britain a selected class, possessed of the representation, did not dare to face. The most unmitigated democracy known to the annals of the world resolutely reduced at its own cost prospective liabilities of the state which the aristocratic and plutocratic and monarchical government of the United Kingdom has been contented ignobly to hand over to posterity." *

Most instructive have been the popular movements by which this resplendent financial result have been achieved, and almost equally instructive are those by which it has been opposed. How has financial wickedness in politics been prevented? How was good financial sense under universal suffrage secured? The whole world has an interest in the answer to these questions.

Eye witnesses of our history for the last five years are frequently whispering that the newspapers and ministers, and not politicians and financiers, saved the nation from repudiation. This contemporary opinion will be of interest to the future historian. The New York *Nation*, which has a peculiar fondness for the ministry, affirms that the ministers and the newspapers together have saved the

* "Kin beyond Sea," *North American Review*, Sept. 1878, pp. 188, 189.

nation from repudiating its debts and swindling its creditors. It asserts roundly that if the ministers had not attacked the financial heresies of the last two years as sin, or a disguised attempt to cheat, and if the leading newspapers had not taught honesty unflinchingly, politicians would have been unable to resist the current of popular error on great questions of finance. Without the combined influence of the pulpit and press on public opinion, probably some politicians would have led off in a great financial experiment that would have ended in wreck and repudiation.

The act providing for the resumption of specie payments became a law January 14th, 1875.

What winds burst forth out of Ohio, and Indiana, and the Mississippi Valley generally the moment it was determined to resume specie payment on the first day of 1879! Strange storms, never known before in American politics were let loose. It ought not to be, and yet it will be soon forgotten how Congress was importuned to repeal the Resumption Act, and how the House of Representatives was widely supposed to have power to make ninety cents equal to a hundred.

If a newly-organized national party had achieved success, there would have been fastened upon us the searching curse of fiat money and a political currency.

A silver bill, which the President vetoed as inconsistent with the national promise to pay its debts in coin, passed the House November 5th, 1877, by a vote of 164 to 34.

A bill to repeal the Resumption Act, or so much of it as provided for the redemption in coin of the United States legal-tender notes, passed the House November 23rd, 1877, by a vote of 133 to 120.

Mr. Gladstone says the facts to our credit should be told out; and so should these other facts to our shame.

The Senate, however, operated as the saucer does upon the teacup. You remember that Washington said to Lafayette, once at a dinner table: "We need two bodies in our legislative branch. We want this hot teacup to represent the popular feeling. The House of Representatives should be close to the people's firesides. But we need the Senate as the saucer to cool the teacup a little." Neither the saucer nor the teacup would be well alone. We need the hotness, and we need the assuaged hotness also, and so must have both parts of this furniture of the table. Now this wisdom of Washington has again and again been justified by the discussions of the last two years. The Senate at least twice has crushed repudiation schemes of the Lower House.

Without indorsing the assertion that the newspapers and ministers together have saved us, I may be allowed to affirm that it appears to me capable of verification that the ministers and the newspapers and the Senate and an honest Executive have saved us.

I am not discussing this matter from a point of view of partisan politics; but from that of American institutions, out of which we do see that good sense has some chance to come, even under universal suffrage. We were told lately by a Southern senator that the time may not be far distant when the large representation of New England in the Senate will be attacked on the ground of its injustice to other portions of the Union. Texas, which is larger than France, has two senators only. California, although larger than Italy, has only two. But Rhode Island, hardly large enough for a county, has as much power in the Senate as Texas or California. The group of six small New England States weighs as much in the Senate as the vast commonwealths of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa put together. Our Government is one of checks and balances. It is not a pure democracy. New England has always stood for the

checks and balances; and in the last two years Providence has stood for them and justified their existence and activity! If we had not had the two houses, or if the basis of representation in the Upper House had been what it is in the Lower, who knows but that financial heresy would have swept the good sense of the nation from its moorings?

The colleges in the Mississippi Valley were against the Silver Bill. I was told in the centre of Iowa, by President Magoun, one of the superb leaders of sound policies in the West, that when the Bland Silver Bill was before the House twelve or fifteen Western colleges sent a petition to Washington against it, and that the paper was signed by nearly every professor in those institutions. We know what excellent work the Hard-money League of Chicago has been doing. I am not assailing the West for her position as to the Silver Bill. There were two parties in the Mississippi Valley; and if the schools and ministers there were sometimes misled, the best of them were not. The best of the newspaper press in the West were not misled, although the best in newspapers is a small percentage there and here. The West reads Western daily newspapers, and not Eastern. It is easy to overestimate the extent of the influence of our seaboard daily newspapers. Your daily is not a daily three hundred miles from the place where it is published, but a paper of the second day. We are not to attribute all the turns of political sentiment in the United States to the peculiar inclinations the pens of the New York editors may have. A few New York monthlies and one or two weeklies reach the whole nation; but the average citizen of Chicago rarely sees the New York dailies. Our nation is not like England, where one newspaper can easily reach every coast of an island so small that when an American walks in his sleep there he is in danger of stepping off the land. Englishmen are proud of the fact that the very best discussions of the London dailies go to the remotest quarters of England and Scotland; and they well may value this one excellent effect of their insularity. It is not the fact that the best American daily newspapers go to all quarters of our immense territory. Therefore, we must give praise to several vigorous newspapers that in the West stood right on the financial question; and to the newspapers in the South and the half-dozen or dozen statesmen there who stood right on that subject. It is not true that the seaboard led the whole nation.

The West is very haughty on financial topics if asked to accept without change the position of the seaboard, from which she has borrowed so much. There is nothing subtler, I suppose, in the reasons that induced a part of the West to oppose a financial policy almost unanimously favoured by the seaboard than the fact that so much has been borrowed by the West from the East that it is often supposed capitalists here have interested motives in all discussions of financial questions. Therefore, let us give the more praise to the Western press, so far as it was right, and to the Western pulpit, and to any Western statesmen who were not misled by the popular clamour.

There has been more than one occasion in the history of the United States when the ministry has given hope to the National Executive. Commissioner Eaton told me, in the Educational Bureau at Washington, not three months ago, that one of the most impressive things President Lincoln ever said to him was that the sheet-anchor of the cause of the Union in the darkest days of the War clung to the pulpits of the Northern and Western States. If the ministry had not taken a right position on financial issues in the last two years, we should have had trouble in the next presidential campaign with these same issues. If the recent discussion has not saved the nation from the ultimate recurrence of such heresies in our politics, it has saved the next presidential campaign from being carried by any apologist for socialistic opinions in finance.

While, therefore, we take some credit to ourselves for diminishing rapidly our national debt and executing a buffeted resumption act; while we accept with proper humility the praise Mr. Gladstone has given us, in his contrast of the American democracy with the British aristocracy; while we look on the unexampled financial vigour of our nation at a date so near the time when some of us despaired of her life; while we anticipate the not distant day when she will be the wealthiest of nations; while we remember how France has paid her crushing indebtedness swiftly, and is a republic, let us not quite give up hope as to popular suffrage. And even here in Boston, where, as Mr. Phillips says, we do not believe in republican institutions, let us not quite despair when a republic, with all its faults, honestly pays its debts, here and in Paris.

The Lecture.

It is a suggestive circumstance that the first discourse ever uttered in the world had a lie for its text and converted half its hearers. The dismal science of political economy, when it discusses the question whether justice is a peril to capitalists, often takes for its text the lie that the relations between capital and labour are a see-saw; or that as the labourer goes up the capitalist will go down, and that as the labourer goes down the capitalist must go up. This is Ricardo's doctrine. This is to-day the theory of several universities, but not of the best ones; and, thank God, it is a doctrine oftener and oftener assailed of late in the name of political economy itself, as represented by Professors Cairnes, and Jevons, and Bonamy Price, and our own Professors Bowen and Walker. Governor Winthorp, of Massachusetts, tells a story which illustrates the average opinion of political economists of the older school concerning the relations of labour and capital. "I may, upon this occasion," he writes, "repeat a passage between one Rowley and his servant. The master, being forced to sell a pair of oxen to pay his servant his wages, told the servant he could keep him no longer, not knowing how to pay him the next year. The servant answered him that he would serve him for more of his cattle. 'But how shall I do,' said the master, 'when all my cattle are gone?' The servant replied: 'you shall then serve me, and so you may have your cattle again.'" *

This is the see-saw theory of wages and profits;

1. The amount of capital which in any country can be devoted at a given time to the payment of wages is a dividend.

2. The number of labourers who, in that country, at the given time ask for wages is a divisor.

3. The rate of wages which can be paid in that country at the

* "History of New England," p. 219.

given time is the quotient obtained by dividing the amount of capital by the number of labourers.

4. There is no fighting against the rules of arithmetic; and, therefore there is no way to increase this quotient without enlarging the dividend or diminishing the divisor.

5. The foregoing dividend, which is called a wages-fund, is a part of the aggregate capital of a country, and the ratio between that capital and the amount devoted to the payment of wages may vary with the conditions of industry and the habits of the people; but at any given time the dividend is a definite part of the aggregate capital, and cannot be increased by law, or public opinion, or compassion on the part of employers, or the efforts of the working classes.

6. The wages-fund is distributed by competition.

7. More than the amount of the wages-fund the wages-receiving class cannot possibly divide among them.

8. That amount and no less they cannot but obtain.

9. The working-man who wants higher wages is to be told that, as the wages-fund is fixed in amount, if he receives more, some other labourer must for that reason receive less or be kept out of employment altogether.

10. Competition is so perfect that the labourer always realizes the highest wages the employer can afford to pay; or else, as consumer, is rewarded by the lower price of commodities.

11. Wages and profits are drawn from the same fund.

12. Profits depend on wages.

13. Profits and wages increase and diminish, therefore, at each other's expense, and what is gained on the one side is lost on the other.

14. The industrial world is therefore a ghastly battle-field, on which capital and labour are of necessity ever at war, and where victory and its spoils must go to the stronger.*

In these accursed principles you have the veins and arteries through which circulates most of the black blood of the feud between capital and labour and of socialistic and communistic discontent in modern times. Carlyle calls political economy the dismal science, because up to a late date it has taught propositions such as these.

* Statements of the theory here summarized may be found scattered in detached form through many treatises of the older school in political economy. See the doctrine of the wages-fund defended by Professor Fawcett, "Economic Position of the British Labourer," p. 120; by John Stuart Mill, *Fortnightly Review*, May, 1869; and Professor Perry, of Williams College, "Political Economy," pp. 122, 123.

But it is the glory of the best recent discussions in political economy to have ripped open these poisoned veins and to have let out much of this black blood. It may be that on this theme I shall have great difficulty in obtaining a hearing with older men, who have been taught in a school of political economy now obsolete or obsolescent, while we younger men have been brought up in a new school. If I seem to speak disrespectfully of Ricardo and of the theory of a wages-fund, remember that Bonamy Price and Cairnes and Walker do the same. Professor Bowen, representing Harvard University, explicitly rejects that theory.* I take up here Professor Walker's work on wages, as perhaps the best treatise America has given us on the subject and certainly a book representing Yale College, and you will find the whole volume employed in combating those very assumptions, which may prejudice many here against my proposition, that the see-saw theory as to wages and profits is as unsound in social science as it is cruel in social practice. For instance, Professor Walker says:

"I regret that this treatise should be so strongly controversial in form; but the fact is, certain doctrines, which I deem to be wholly unfounded, have become so widely spread that one can make no progress by so much as a step towards a philosophy of wages without encountering them. These doctrines are:

"That there is a wage-fund, irrespective of the numbers and industrial quality of the labouring population, constituting the sole source from which wages can at any time be drawn.

"That competition is so far perfect that the labourer, as a producer, always realizes the highest wages which the employer can afford to pay; or else, as consumer, is recompensed in the lower price of commodities for any injury he may chance to suffer as producer.

"That, in the organization of modern industrial society, the labourer and the capitalist are together sufficient unto production, the actual employer of labour being regarded as the capitalist, or else as the mere stipendiary agent and creature of the capitalist, receiving a remuneration which can properly be treated like the wages of ordinary labour.

"These doctrines I have found it necessary to controvert; and in so doing have not cared to mince matters or pick phrases."

These are in substance the doctrines of Ricardo. They are pretty nearly the doctrines of John Stuart Mill. Bonamy Price accuses Mill himself of introducing utter confusion into the topic of profits.†

A man is a man even if his father was rich. I have defended the interests of working-men; and if now I defend those of capitalists and

---

* See *North American Review*, cxx., pp. 93, 94, note.

† "Practical Political Economy," London, 1878, p. 135.

manufacturers you will remember that many of the latter were working-men once, and that in America any man with the proper spirit of self-help may become a capitalist.

Do fair wages drive employers into bankruptcy? Is justice a peril to capitalists? Is it impossible to pay natural wages and make reasonable profits?

A startlingly large proportion of the employing class does not escape financial distress. Here is a very suggestive pamphlet on "Common-sense Views on Political Economy," by J. H. Walker, Esq., of Worcester, Mass., who testified, at their request, before the Hewitt Congressional Committee. Mr. Walker discusses the fate of business men.* He tells us that in 1840 there were four firms in Worcester engaged in the chief industry of the state—the manufacture of boots and shoes. They comprised seven individuals, and only one of these manufacturers died in comfortable circumstances in advanced age. Two of them were at work for Mr. Walker as journeymen when prostrated by their final sickness. In 1850 there were twenty-one firms manufacturing boots and shoes in Worcester, comprising twenty-four members. All but four of these failed in business and only two have retired with any capital. In 1860 there were twenty-three firms engaged in the same business in Worcester, comprising thirty individuals. Of these twenty-three firms twelve have failed, and of the individuals who comprised the firms only eight are now manufacturing and only two have gone out of the business with any capital.

When I stand here and assert that the labour of an able-bodied slave, is computed to be worth twice his maintenance, and that the service of the meanest labourer cannot be worth less than that of an able-bodied slave, you remember the number of business failures and the frequent financial straits of employers, and you think I am teaching heresy, that I am trenching upon the great rights of capital, that I am dropping out of the region of science in political economy. But these propositions were those of Adam Smith;† these propositions are those of John Stuart Mill himself. Why, here is Mill, cool as an iceberg on this topic, but straightforward as a sunbeam. "Where the wife of a labouring man does not by general custom contribute to his earnings the man's wages must be at least sufficient to support himself, a wife, and a number of children adequate to keep up the population; *since, if it were less, the population would not be kept up.*"‡

If this be, indeed, a natural law, who knows but these business

* P. 10.

† See "Wealth of Nations," Book I., chap. viii.

‡ "Political Economy," Book II, chap. xiv.

failures come into collision with nature itself? Who knows but that Ricardo, after all, was right, and that the natural relations of labour to capital are those of war? Occasionally manufacturers retain their operatives in employment at a loss. I know there are princes in our manufacturing establishments who sometimes suffer financially in order to be generous to their operatives in hard times. But nobody expects these exceptions to become the general rule. I am speaking not of the princes, but of the average condition of trade under the stern law of supply and demand; and I wish to ascertain whether under that law it is indeed true that the condition of capital and labour must be that of war.

In England, at the town of Merthyr, a great mining district, a strike occurred in which a desperate attempt was made to keep wages up to the standard of working men. The labourers refused to believe that their employers could not pay them what they demanded. The employers said: "We will prove to you that we are sincere. We will put out our furnaces and inflict on ourselves a great loss if you continue this strike. This loss will be less than that of paying the wages you ask." The working men would not be convinced. They demanded the "minimum wage," as it was called; did not obtain opportunity to look into the books of their employers; could not credit the assertion that the employers were unable to pay more without dropping into bankruptcy; kept up the strike, and the masters put their furnaces out of blast, extinguished their fires, made work impossible for a long period, and so brought calamity on the trade of a whole district. This was their proof that the wages asked could not be paid. The industrial world abounds with similar evidence that employers are often sincere when they say that they cannot pay higher wages and live. Of course, if they do not live the working men cannot be employed.

What if we could give a majority of working men employment at what I call fair wages? Can we bring all working men into employment? Must such as cannot find employment at fair wages go to the workhouse? Is it not better to accept half a loaf as wages than nothing? If there is only a fixed amount of bread to be divided, and mouths are too many, must not some live on half rations? Must not some die? Would it not be better if some were never born? John Stuart Mill says society might possibly take care of all the labourers now on the planet; but that we cannot be called upon to take care of as many more human beings as they who are already here choose to bring into existence. Unless there be some check on population there will be no safety for society, even if capital should undertake to provide work for all. Philanthropy itself cannot pro-

mise to do that; and, therefore, Mill thinks it looks as if Ricardo were right, and as if we must adhere to his dismal doctrines.

I see no way out of the wilderness into which our discussion of labour and socialism has led us but through adherence to our fundamental maxim—definitions first, and then, following definitions, clear ideas in logical order as stepping stones across every marsh. On my table there is a collection of treasures or rubbish—I hardly know which to call it—on political economy; ten or twelve feet of volumes representing the best discussions in social science for the last two hundred years. Gather and examine in chronological order any such collection of books, and you will find that down to about 1840 or 1850 they are full of the see-saw theory of wages and profits, and teach a Godless science; a series of propositions utterly without piety and having in mind no Christian principles. About 1840 and 1850, after the reform laws in Great Britain came into force, you find this series of books changing position; and God be praised that to-day political economy does not deserve to be called the dismal science.

Here is a series of propositions which I have not extracted from any book; but upon which I am willing to put my feet in the tangle of this morass, out of which perhaps some of you have thought that we should never escape.

Natural wages have been defined here, and we must now attempt a definition of natural profits. Face to face with a see-saw theory in political economy, our question is whether natural wages and natural profits are consistent with each other.

1. Natural profits consist of three parts: interest on capital, insurance against risk, and remuneration for superintendence.

This is a difficult and yet a standard definition, and in its support both the authorities of the older and those of the newer school of political economists are agreed.*

Whoever puts money into business, of course, expects to get back as much as he would receive in interest if he were to lend his funds. In England, where the rate of interest is low, this portion of profit may reasonably enough be low; but in Australia, where the rate of interest is ten per cent., the profit ought to be higher, because money is worth more at interest. All these matters are parts of arithmetic. I am not here to appeal to you in the name of philanthropy against the multiplication table. Fair profits should include interest on capital; but this portion of profits should not amount, as it often does, to twenty, thirty, and fifty per cent. in a country

* See Fawcett's "Manual," p. 160.

where capital can be borrowed for ten, or six, or perhaps four per cent. interest.

Fair profits also include insurance against risk, and this will be high or low according to circumstances in different cases. Remuneration for risk capitalists estimate high enough, if they have their own way. An author, publishing a book, is told he must not have any large percentage of the profit, because he does not take any risk. The publisher takes all the risk; and so even a Longfellow, I suppose, obtains only about ten per cent. on his copyright, although one would think there is no risk in many cases of publication. The rule is that the publisher taking the risk must be compensated. How shall we determine how much this portion of profit should be? This is, or ought to be, a matter of arithmetic too. You go to the insurance companies and ask for how much they will insure certain trades or certain kinds of property, and you will find that there can be a very exact calculation made here.

2. As the legal rate of interest shows what the first part of natural profits should be, so the average rate of insurance shows what the second part of natural profits should be.

You are not here to take the capitalist's words that his risks ought to have such and such remuneration. You will do better to go to the insurance companies. You will do best to study competitions of capitalists with each other, and so ascertain what the second part of profits naturally should be. There should, of course, be remuneration for superintendence; and some political economists say that the way to find out how much should be allowed for this third element in natural profits is to take the gross excess of earnings over expenditures and subtract the first two parts of natural profits. What is left ought to go as pay for superintendence. That is a partisan plea. There is a way of ascertaining what is the just remuneration for superintendence. What can you hire superintendence for? You are yourself, let us suppose, not able to manage your own business, and must have an agent. What must you pay him? He puzzles his head with your great enterprises. You are sick, you are withdrawn entirely, you are a sleeping partner in the concern, and somebody takes your place. What do you pay him?

3. What would be paid as wages of superintendence is the just measure of the amount of the third element in natural profits.

Taking the legal rate of interest for the first part of natural profits, and asking the insurance companies, and learning of the competitions between capitalists, what the second part should be, and counting in for the third part what you would pay to an agent who should occupy your place, I say that, adding these three things

together, you have what ought to be the profits of industry on the average. Some kinds of business have a high risk; and if that be surmounted the profit will be very large, because the insurance against risk must be very large. Some have to pay large interest on capital if they borrow from banks, and so the bank rates will lessen the size of natural profits. I will make allowance for all these circumstances; concede to the capitalist all just claims; and yet must affirm that it is fair to define natural profits as consisting of these three things, and of these only; interest on capital, insurance against risk, and remuneration for superintendence. Everything in my argument depends on that definition.

4. The rate of profit in any business depends on the excess of earnings over expenses.

This is a truism; but, as Bonamy Price remarks, "truisms have great place in political economy," and he might have said in every other science. They are the self-evident propositions which are the supporting frame-work of all reasoning.

As I could afford on no occasion, in the presence of scholars here, to put before you careless statements; so now in the presence of men of affairs whom this subject has attracted to this hall, I dare not talk sentimentally. I must face the stern facts of trade; I must recognize the power of the law of supply and demand; but do I not carry your assent to my next proposition?

5. The excess of earnings over expenses depends on the rate of interest charged by banks for borrowed capital, the rate of insurance against risk, the cost of machinery, the state of the market, the rate of wages, and a multitude of other circumstances, chief among which is the efficiency of labour.

6. The rate of profit, therefore, depends on a variety of circumstances, of which the rate of wages is only one.

7. Ricardo's doctrine that the rate of profit depends on wages only is, therefore, an inaccurate, because an inexhaustive statement of the case.

8. *When the efficiency of labour is increased by the improvement of machinery, or any other cause, profits may be increased, although wages remain the same.*

9. *It may happen that from the same causes both the rate of wages and the rate of profit may be increased at the same time.*

There is no see-saw in the relations between labour and capital if these propositions are true; and now let us test them. Here is a factory. It is supplied with machinery for making cotton cloth. Every ten men in the factory can make a hundred yards of cotton cloth

a day. Now some Edison invents new machinery, and by the use of this ten men can make a thousand yards of cloth a day. Let us suppose that the inventor of the machinery has been so skilful as to make it cheaply. Let the machinery of the new sort cost no more than that of the old sort. If a hundred hours of labour with imperfect machinery produce a hundred yards of cloth, and a hundred hours of labour with new and no more costly machinery will produce a thousand yards, and you pay your labourers the same wages for running the new machinery as for running the old, is it not perfectly evident that by the use of the new machinery and the increased efficiency of the labour you have doubled, trebled, or, it may be, increased tenfold your profits, while yet wages remain the same? But Ricardo says that as wages go up profits go down, and as profits go up wages go down. That is not the case, as this example shows. By the use of the improved machinery here the factory produces ten times what it did before, with the same labour. The machinery costs no more, the wages of the ten operatives are no higher; but the efficiency of their labour is increased ten-fold, and profits are increased many times in consequence. The price of cotton cloth may fall if you produce too much of it; but as it falls in price it will find more buyers. It is very evident that profits may be increased, although wages remain the same.

It is, moreover, perfectly conceivable that the new machinery might be so much better than the old that the wages might be lifted somewhat and yet profits be increased at the same time. You paid these labourers a dollar and a half a day with the old machinery. Suppose you pay them two dollars a day with the new. Your profits might yet be increased, for that rise of wages would not use up the margin created by the improved efficiency of labour. Where is the business man who does not see that Ricardo's position fails in this case? But this one example tests the problem. This case is typical of every steady employment.

10. It is a most mischievous falsehood to teach that wages and profits are a see-saw, that they are drawn from the same fund, and that they necessarily increase or diminish at the expense of each other.

11. It is this falsehood which misleads both capitalists and labourers into the notion that, under fixed natural law, capital and labour must be at war, and that the industrial world is a battle-field.

12. Large profits do not come from low wages so much as from large establishments, well managed.

Improved machinery is only one of many means of increasing the efficiency of labour. De Tocqueville tells us, and so do the

political economists, that, other things being equal, the profits of an establishment are in proportion to its size. I add to my factory floors square rod after square rod, until I have acres filled with whizzing looms. In various ways I can now cheapen the cost of superintendence. I may have a railway opened to the market, instead of sending my goods by the broad-wheeled waggon. All this time, while my profits are increasing, wages may remain the same. How is it we have lived under this lie so long, and have believed that all the capitalist gets the labourer must lose, and that all the labourer gets the capitalist must lose? It is that theory which makes the bitter blood between capital and labour oftener than you think. And it is a lie, every syllable of it.

Here is a merchant on India Wharf, in Boston, and he sends his goods to India and brings back cargoes from there. He may have a fair voyage or he may have a storm, just as the agriculturist may have a wet season or a dry. Now, what have the wet season or the dry, what have the storms or the calms, to do with the rate of wages? Undoubtedly wages are one element in the expenses of every business; but they are not the only element. They are only one finger on the palm. It may be they are the forefinger; but these other expenses—accident rate of interest for the capital you must borrow, access to the market, efficiency of labour, insurance against risk, a score of circumstances—are the other fingers on the palm. And, after all, your own personal superintendence, your wise combination of details, is the thumb on that palm. Wages, even if they are the forefinger, are evidently not as important a part of the problem as these other circumstances taken together. It is utterly false to go upon the supposition that the hand of industry is only a hook, and that wages are its only finger. Let us open our minds to the whole problem. Let us take into view, as labouring men find it difficult to do at times, all the expenses of the employer, and let the employer take into view all his sources of profit, and it will be seen that there has rarely been taught authoritatively a more mischievous falsehood in political economy than the assertion that wages and capital are of necessity an eternal see-saw, putting the labourer and the employer in a state of constant war.

13. The prosperity of labourers increases their purchasing power, and so adds to the profit of capital.

Where is the business man who wants all the working-men of the United States reduced to the condition of the Japanese and Chinese labourers? Do you think it would add to your prosperity to grind down the working class to the condition of squalor and barbarism? Everybody knows that the way to get money is to increase the pur-

chasing power of the people. You want to sell your goods; therefore you want customers. You must, therefore, see that there is high commercial sagacity in keeping up the standard of living of the average working-man. Let him be able to buy, and you will make profit in selling. Let him not be able to buy and pretty soon you must take care of him in the workhouse, or shut down your factories in part, and so reduce profits.

14. In the steady trades it is historically true that wages and profits in the last half century have usually risen together.

Bread is cheaper now in England than it was fifty years ago; sugar and tea are cheaper; average prices for clothing are lower; but in most of the steady trades the wages of the labourers have risen in the last fifty years in Great Britain, and not merely their nominal wages, but the real wages, or their purchasing power of their days of labour. At the same time, who does not see the prosperity of the manufacturing class in Great Britain, if you take it on the average? Great Britain is wealthy because she is a factory, and prosperous as such. Everybody will grant me the proposition that, taking on the average, the manufacturing business of Great Britain is prosperous, and that its profits have risen, although the wages of operatives have risen.

"The vast increase of the wealth of rich men in England during the last sixty years," says Professor Bonamy Price, "is a fact perceived by every eye. How has it fared with the labouring classes? Do they receive, would they for an instant accept the same wages now as they did then? The labourers have reached a far higher standard of existence. A much more elevated minimum of wages has been secured. This is the result of efficient labour, heartily applied with the aid of machinery, producing much work, cheapening commodities, enlarging the powers of consumers to buy, and diffusing enlarged property in every class. These results do not breathe a syllable about antagonism between masters and workmen." *

Before I close, let me draw a distinction which may clear up the remaining vapour of this theme.

15. In the fluctuating employments the just relations of capital and labour are difficult to ascertain, and have to be found out by the stern application of the law of supply and demand; but the principles applying to other trades govern the fluctuating also.

The trouble, I suppose, between capitalists and labourers often is that the difficulties which arise in the fluctuating trades are supposed to belong to the very root of the relations of labour and capital. It is true that in the fluctuating trades there is a great chance for

* "Practical Political Economy," pp. 237, 238.

rascals to make money when they ought not; there is a great chance to grind the faces of the shop-girl and the poor clerk and the average operative. My discussion here in previous lectures has been concerning the fluctuating trades, rather than the steady trades. When we proved, as we have done, that in the steady trades wages and profits are not a see-saw, we ought to believe that in the fluctuating trades they are not a see-saw, *if we ascertain what Justice is.* Here is my hand. I show you three fingers which shut towards the palm. These are the steady trades, and they are the majority of the trades; but now the fluctuating trades belong to the same palm, and the other finger will be found to shut as the three fingers do. If I prove that in steady trades the interests of capital and labour are identical, I undertake to affirm, by the argument of analogy, that if we could find out what true justice would be to the capitalist and to the labourer in the fluctuating employments, we should find the same principles governing those portions of our industries.

16. It is, therefore, evident, both from history and from correct economical principles, that justice is no peril to capitalists, nor fair wages a diminution of fair profits.

ARE TRADES-UNIONS A NURSERY OF SOCIALISM?

Prelude.—The Evangelization of the World.

There was a time when a traveller could start at Alexandria, in Egypt, and, following the basaltic pavements of the Roman highways, broken only by brief trips on the sea, reach Carthage and the straits of Gibraltar, roll across the plains and hills of Spain and France, sail over the surly English Channel, go northward to the barbaric borders of Scotland, then return through Leyden and Cologne to Milan, and thence drive his unmolested chariot under the shadows of the Alps and Balkans to Constantinople, and through turbulent Asia Minor to Antioch, and thence over the Lebanon range and along the Syrian plain and the green valley of the Nile to Alexandria again—a distance of more than 7,000 miles. Throughout the empire the majesty of Rome, as Pliny proudly declares, was the shield of the wayfarer in every place. Epictetus and the Alexandrian Philo dwell with rapture on the security of the traveller and the facility of intercourse in the Roman world. "Cæsar," writes the Stoic philosopher, "has procured us a profound peace. There are neither wars, nor battles, nor great robberies, nor piracies; but we may travel at all hours, and sail from east to west." Modern scholars are never weary of extolling the magnificence of the Roman Empire, and the unity it gave to the law and trade and political principles of the nations under its sway. Greek scholars kept school in Spain. The women of a Roman colony in Switzerland employed a goldsmith from Asia Minor. In the cities of Gaul were Greek painters and sculptors. Gauls and Germans served as a body-guard of a Jewish king at Jerusalem.* In the reign of Claudius an embassy came to Rome from a prince of the Island of Ceylon.

Such was the ancient unity of mankind. But what is the modern?

From Rome to the Cataracts of the Nile there stretched a distance so vast that the ancient imagination used to faint over it; but this distance is only equal to that from St. Louis to San Francisco. Rome and Athens are not as far apart as New York and Chicago. Rome and London are not as far from each other as Boston and St. Louis. Plymouth Rock and Pike's Peak are further apart than the Coliseum and the Pyramids. The surf of the Bay of Fundy and the waterfalls of the Yosemite are more distant from each other than London and Thebes, or than the Straits of Gibraltar and the frosty Caucasus. The chariot could not be driven around the outmost roads of the Roman world in less than 100 days; but in less than that time the steamship and the locomotive, however unpoetic they may seem in contrast with the wheels on which Cæsar rode, can now be driven around the globe.

What was the effect of the ancient unity of nations? Assimilation in law, language, trade, and social custom. A vague feeling of human brotherhood. Terence, before a turbulent Roman audience, once happened to pronounce the line, "I am a man, and I regard nothing that concerns man as foreign to me"; and the populace, accustomed to savage fights in the Coliseum—a populace degraded by a mythology in which the gods were represented as lepers; a populace sunk in the luxurious forms of barbarism characteristic of old Rome—applauded

* Friedlander, "*Sittengeschichte Roms.*"

the strange sentiment. Celsus, however, one of the early opponents of Christianity, when the question came before him whether any one religion could ever be adopted for the world, answered his own inquiry by a sneer: "Whoever believes that such a religion is possible is insane."

What is to be the effect of the modern unity of nations? What are the opportunities of Christianity now as compared with those it had in Cæsar's vaunted day? How shall the question of Celsus be answered face to face with a world girdled with achievements of which Rome never dreamed? When Paul died, the Roman rim of land around the Mediterranean was the world; and scholars have been taught and, I think, they have allowed the public to rest too long in an enthusiasm concerning that ancient opportunity utterly out of proportion to its size. Nobody knows how many people were in the Roman Empire at its best; but the estimates vary from eighty to one hundred and twenty millions. Take the average, and Paul had an opportunity of reaching, under the shield of the Roman power, fewer people than will be in the United States alone at the second American centennial. We fall into acclamations over the achievements of the Roman Empire, and our scholars dwell with fervour on the influence of the unity of Rome upon the spread of Christianity in the first century; but we are very inadequately moved when asked to contemplate the growing lines of intercommunication between modern continents, on which there is now not a single foreign shore.

Whoever will glance at a map of the routes of ocean traffic will see that the world is fast becoming commercially a unit. The vast interests of ocean transit and the yet vaster of land transit are every year more closely interwoven. The United States and Great Britain, if they unite against piracy on the oceans, will be united against all war on the land. Pompey and Cæsar, it used to be said, had cleared the Mediterranean of pirates. Great Britain and the commercial interests of the United States, it may now almost be said, have cleared all oceans of pirates. Whoever looks at the lines of ocean transit, shooting out in thick warp and woof from coast to coast, will see the shuttles of Almighty Providence weaving the whole world into a commercial unity far closer than ever existed under Cæsar in the Roman Empire.

By a preconcerted arrangement, the shores of nearly every sea, and multitudes in the chief cities of the planet, were united yesterday in prayer for the evangelization of the world. Christian union was the theme of the hour. It appears to be also the theme of the supreme powers who govern the ages.

I have no means of judging of the future of prophecy except by the past. Two points are incontrovertible — that prophecy has been fulfilled, and that we have reason, therefore, to believe that it will be again. I open a Book three thousand years old, and I read that the stone cut out of the mountain shall fill the whole earth. That prophecy has come to pass. I read that there will be a day when a kingdom shall be given to a religion founded in a specified centre of the world. That day has come. Here is a Book, whether you call it inspired or not, which predicted the coming of this kingdom long before the first upstretching aurora of its light was seen above the East. That Book has kept its promise with the nations. It has other promises yet unfulfilled. It will keep those also. When I look at the map of the world, and see the shuttles of intercommunication among nations thrown out north, south, east and west, I hear the unfolding of the leaves of prophecy. The time has come when knowledge is increased, and many run to and fro. It is within the power of the Christians now on the globe to cause the Gospel to be preached to every living human creature before the end of this century.

What has Providence meant in carrying forward all the years of human history according to a given plan? I believe that what God does He from the first intended

to do. When I sat under Abraham's oak, at Hebron, I opened the Scriptures, and read that from a chosen man should spring a chosen family; and that from a chosen family should spring a chosen race; and that from a chosen race should spring a founder of a new religious empire; and that out of a chosen race should thus come a chosen religion; and that this religion should embrace the earth. There stood the prophecies on the pages which I opened under the Syrian skies. No one doubts that these predictions were written ages before the date at which they began to be fulfilled. They are numerous and full of details. Prophecies concerning the dispersion of the Jews. Rationalism drops them like hot iron every time it dares to discuss them. As I sat three hours alone under Abraham's oak, and read these statements concerning chosen man, family, nation, and religion, I could not but be impressed, I will not say with the feeling of superstition, but certainly with those of awe and terror, and faith and hope. I revered straightforward thinking, and looked at the page of history. I could not but say that these mysterious prophecies have come to pass. There was a chosen man. There was a chosen family. There was a chosen nation. There has come from that nation a chosen religion. It is spreading over the world. When I looked upward towards the sky, through the boughs of the oak, and remembered how under one of the progenitors of that tree Abraham entertained angels unawares, I could not but feel that human history casting out its boughs in every direction—in Asia, in Europe, in America, and in the isles of the sea—is under the control of a mysterious providence, and that God, who has for three thousand and four thousand years so conducted human affairs as to bring into power a certain set of religious opinions, will go on doing that in time to come. I shall not, for one, drop into anxiety at any little reactionary eddy, when I find that an irresistible gulf-current, bursting out of the tropics of human history, is moving in one direction, and has been so moving for thousands of years.

Fasten attention upon the day when Abraham sat under the oaks at Hebron, and the day when Paul went out of the Ostian gate to die, and upon our present day. Three points determine the circumference of any curve. Draw a circle through these three points—Abraham's oak, the Ostian gate when Paul went through it, and the present hour—and I undertake to say that any man who loves clear ideas and will stand at the centre of that historical circle will be thrown into awe before the fulfilment of prophecy. I set no dates. Prophecy is, perhaps, never adequately explained except by its fulfilment. I will not attack the devout scholars who have lately in a prophetic conference discussed these topics with great learning and earnestness. Much mischief, no doubt, may come from mysticism on the topic of prophecy; but more mischief may come from our coldness, from our indifference on this theme, and from our unwillingness to look upon the absolutely overawing facts that prophecy has been fulfilled, that as the past has been so the future will be, and that as God has kept so He will continue to keep His word with us. The same mysterious predictions which have been fulfilled to the letter for four thousand years foretell also the enswathing of the globe with a kingdom which now very nearly touches arms around it.

Nay, I may affirm that the arms already touch. Suppose that Lord Beaconsfield obtains what he says he is seeking — a scientific boundary for India, or the Himalayas as a barrier against attack from the north. England is now led by a political party greatly blind to what is just. When the pride of the average Briton is offended, his conscience easily goes to sleep. England fears attack from Russia, or it is the scheme of her present rulers to cause her to do so. The anticipation that some day a troublesome attack may be made on British power in the East by Russia, is causing not a few good men on the other side of the Atlantic to hold their

peace while what I call (you may have your own opinion; I do not ask you to adopt mine) an unjust attack is made on Afghanistan. If, however, in time past, the evil that men have done has sometimes been overruled; if the mischief Cæsar and Pompey did was of indirect use in the production of peace around the Mediterranean; if that peace was used as a platform on which early Christianity took its place; if in every age the purposes of the Supreme Powers have been approaching accomplishment, no matter how men have acted, we must regard it, I think, as probable that out of the turmoil in the East will come in some way an advance of the divine plan to give the globe to Christianity.

If there should be a scientific frontier obtained for Northern India, any attack on British power in the East will be rendered well-nigh impossible. It is not from little Cyprus that Great Britain is to resist Russia; it is not even from the Bosphorus that she can successfully protect herself against the great power of the north. I suppose military men are very well agreed with Lord Beaconsfield in the opinion that it is from Afghanistan that British power in the East must obtain its security.

Give England a firm frontier in the Himalayas; let that gigantic mountain-barrier prevent a land attack on her Eastern Empire, and then, since there can be no naval attack on her with any success, the future of Asia Minor, of Persia, of India, and of all the torrid seaboard of Asia, will be determined under British, and, I may say, under American influences. We have a deep foothold of our own in Asia Minor. British and American fashions in politics, education, and religion will be carried steadily on towards China so surely as the scientific barrier is established in Afghanistan. Thus, as Homer said, the plan of the gods is advancing. Who dares stand in the way of that plan? The unity of mankind is asserting itself more and more; and who shall resist it?

A Cabinet at Washington, it is said, talks haughtily to China, and desires to have the Burlingame treaty modified, or perhaps abrogated. China will not consent to its modification. If we choose to abrogate it, she cannot resist; and I suppose there is great danger that the Burlingame treaty will be abrogated, out and out, and that America, under the lead of a bloodthirsty mob on the Pacific coast and fifth-rate politicians there, will shut our doors on the Pacific to emigrants willing to earn their own living. I do not purpose to discuss the Chinese question. I hope to go to California in June, to act as your outlook committee on that subject. America has in California a door to China; America, in Asia Minor, has already opened a door to the sunset side of Asia. If Providence is proposing the regeneration of Asia by the increase of American and British influence along the Asiatic seaboard; if all the signs in the world, in short, show that there must be relations of justice between China and the United States, and our Cabinet at Washington, wishing to save the vote of California in a national election, does differ from the Supreme Powers, and is ready to do an act of injustice, the ultimate result will be that not the hoodlums of San Francisco and not even the Cabinet will triumph over the plan of history.

The unity of mankind will assert itself more and more. The day will come when there will be just relations between the whole Asiatic seaboard and America and England. When that time arrives, who does not know that the American school and the British and American missionary societies will be welcome to the Asiatic coast? Who does not see that lines of steamships will bring labour there into new demand? Who does not see a commercial regeneration slowly preparing for Asia? Who does not find in the gulf-current bursting out of the time of Abraham through that of Paul and Cæsar, and down to our day, an indication of our duty, not merely to missions, and not merely towards Great Britain when she carries her power into Asia Minor, but also towards the hoodlums of California, and towards

all who would lead us into a policy of injustice, of narrowness, and of barbarity? Let us not set ourselves against the Supreme Powers. When the gulf-current of history gathers its strength against any impediment, as in the case of slavery, and builds itself up behind the bulwark, we know how at last obstacles give way and devastation follows.

Let Americans place no obstacles in the way of the unity of mankind. If the plan of the Supreme Powers for the regeneration of Asia must dam itself up behind the barrier of American political exclusiveness, or behind the bulwark of American penuriousness in supporting schools at home and abroad, the overturn of these impediments will give us trouble. Let us make no attempt to place obstacles before the gulf-current of history. Let it have free course; let it move out of the tropics in time to come, as it has in time past; let it flow to every coast of the globe! Let us launch our fleets upon it and float with it. The Christian world has now knelt down to pray seven days for the free course of a gulf-current proceeding from Abraham's time, through Cæsar's, to our own; and a sufficient reason for believing that the petitions will be granted is that there is prophecy that they shall be, and that prophecy in all the past has been fulfilled to the letter.

The Lecture.

When once we are convinced that natural wages and natural profits may exist together we have passed through what I call the see-saw swamp in political economy, and on the firm land beyond the marsh most of the questions concerning hours of labour, co-operation, and industrial partnership adjust themselves without state interference.

It is hardly more than fifty years since the first fully endowed professorships in political economy were founded in England. The history of the science dates in Great Britain, as everyone knows, from the publication of Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," in 1776. You remember that in Oxford, in 1825, Mr. Henry Drummond, a member of Parliament, endowed the first professorship on this subject. A similar chair was founded in Cambridge in 1828; but was not regularly established by the University until 1863, when Henry Fawcett was elected the first professor. It should surprise no one that political economy has exhibited something of crudeness in its youth. As a branch of university instruction it can hardly be said to have attained maturity yet, in spite of the labours of McCulloch and Mill. Archbishop Whateley, as ministers will remember, expressed his opinion of the interest the science ought to have for the clergy, by himself founding a professorship of political economy at the University of Dublin. In 1871 a school of political science was founded at Paris by Boutmy, and its graduates are commonly at the head of the list of successful aspirants in the competitive examinations for places in the civil service of France.

Young as it is, the philosophy of political science, as treated in the universities, has seen two or three revolutions. There are three or four schools of political economy; and it happens that the best American and German schools are agreed in denouncing what I have here called the see-saw theory, and that only the older school in Great Britain supports it. The younger British school—represented now by Bonamy Price, Professor Cairnes, and Professor Jevons—do not adopt the dismal theory that the relations of capital and labour are a see-saw, and that what one gains the other must lose, and that the two must, therefore, live in an internecine war. These teachers reject the theory of a wages-fund.

It is very important to notice that Lassalle, the father of modern German socialism, obtained his impressions of political economy largely from Malthus and Ricardo, the leaders of the dismalest sort of discussion in the dismal science. Lassalle used to say that if the English school of political economists, who had all the knowledge of modern times, was right, there was nothing for the working classes but slavery, or a revolt against capital, as the natural enemy of labour. In Germany, the school represented by Schulze-Delitzsch founded itself on the improved positions of a new political economy; and they were American rather than English. He founded himself largely on the American Carey and on the German List. Schulze-Delitzsch proclaims no attack on property. He escapes the see-saw marsh in which Lassalle was choked. He did much to cause working-men's savings-banks and co-operative societies to be founded throughout the German Empire. At this hour Schulze-Delitzsch divides with Lassalle the hearts of German working-men. Lassalle represents the early mistakes, Schulze-Delitzsch the growing maturity of political economy.

I congratulate this audience that it has passed through the ooze of early crudities in political science, and has found firm land on the other side. As we look back, however, we see trades-unions up to their knees in the fatal see-saw marsh. Trades-unions are most of them built on the fallacious theory that capital and labour must of necessity be at eternal war, because they draw their reward from the same fund.

I. This is the creed of most trades-unionists:—

(1) Capital and labour are in direct antagonism, because they divide the wages-fund between them, and what one gains the other loses.

(2) Capitalists can combine and enforce lower wages than the state of the labour market warrants, and they often do so.

(3) Labourers, therefore, must combine and resist coercion by coercion.

(4) Trades-unions throughout a nation should assist each other by organizing contemporaneous strikes, or by assisting strikers to maintain themselves when out of work.

(5) Trades-unions should act as benefit societies.

(6) Trades-unions must lay down and abide by certain economic principles, the chief of which are—

Limitation of the length of the day's work.

Abolition of working by the piece.

Limitation of apprentices.

A uniform wage to be given to all labourers.

Refusal to work with non-unionists.

II. It thus appears that trades-unions are founded on the mistaken principles of an outgrown school in political economy—that is, on the theory that the relations of capital and labour are a see-saw.

III. This lie needs eradication from the minds of trades-unionists, as well as capitalists.

IV. Trades-unions are mischievous so far as they tyrannize over employers and non-unionist working-men.

V. They are useful so far as they inspirit labourers to self-help and take the shape of benefit societies.

VI. Trades-unions are now nearly omnipresent in England and the United States in all the great branches of industry.

VII. They tend to become national.

VIII. They tend to become *international.*

IX. They tend, under universal suffrage, to become *political.*

X. Many of the objects of trades-unions are identical with the objects sought by socialistic political parties.

XI. When the members of trades-unions and the members of socialistic political parties have the same political objects their political alliance is natural.

XII. Under universal suffrage, it is likely to be formidable.

Among the trades-unions in England and Wales there are 32,000 friendly societies, with 4,000,000 members, and more than 55,000,000 dollars accumulated funds. These societies save to the poor fund 10,000,000 dollars a year.*

Nobody, in America, at least, pretends to complain when working-men combine for the fair and just protection of their own interests. Capitalists may combine to protect their own interests; and so, of course, may working-men.

* Fourth Report of Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry on Trades-unions, 1874.

The notorious evil in trades-unions, however, is the tyranny frequently exercised by their members over non-unionist working-men. Open the regulations of some of the trades-unions in Great Britain, and you will find them prohibiting the employment of one's own brother or son unless he is in a trade society. The mason who is called to do a job, and finds he needs a carpenter, must not so much as saw off one plank, but must wait for the carpenter to be summoned to do the work. If the carpenter finds a brick in the way of his saw he must wait until the mason changes the place of the impediment. You must never act as your own assistant. I do not say that a majority of British trades-unions enforce these rules; but some of them do, and they are characteristic of the system. In Leeds the rule is you must not carry more than eight bricks in a hod. You may carry ten in London, and twelve in Liverpool. If trades-unions wish to bring themselves into universal contempt, let them go on legislating against their fellow working-men who are non-unionists. Some years ago a cartoon in *Punch* represented a British working-man in his hovel, without work, during a strike, and his wife cowering over an empty grate, while a well-dressed officer of a working-men's trades-union was berating the husband for his intention to go to work. "You mean to work, do you? You mean to give in, do you? Not if I know it." There is no form of tyranny worse than unionists have sometimes exercised over non-unionist working-men. Mr. Gladstone, discussing this topic once, and defending the right of four men who had been persecuted because they were non-unionist labourers, said: "If Great Britain has become a place where the majority can oppress the minority in this way, it has come to be a place of which I should say that the sooner we get out of it the better." In regard to the United States, which is under a suffrage wider than that of Great Britain, we may say, with more emphasis than Gladstone's, that if trades-unions obtain the political power they are seeking, and act as they usually have done when able to have their own way, the United States will soon be such a place that the sooner we get out of it the better. A New York citizen, who wanted papering done in his house, ordered it of a society man, as he was called, and the bill brought in was ten dollars a day. "Well, but your work is not worth this," said the employer. "Yes; but you cannot get anybody to do it for less. I belong to a trades-union, and we have all agreed to ask a certain price. You will find, on investigation, I am asking you what any one else will." This case of shameless extortion is typical of whole ranges of facts that I might put before you. While I denounce these evils of trades-unions, however,

I must not be understood as denying the right of working-men to combine.

May working-men combine in a strike? That is a very rude measure and usually does more harm than good; but it is the chief weapon of trades-unions. You say strikes do not generally succeed. But make a distinction. *On a rising market strikes often succeed; on a falling, they usually fail.* Half the time working-men do not know when to strike. If the prices of goods are rising and working-men strike, manufacturers, of course, cannot afford to shut their mills. But if men strike on a falling market capital can fold its arms and say: "We can make more money by shutting our mills than by keeping them open,"—and sometimes profitably answer the strike by a lock-out. Capital does not starve by waiting; but labour may. Capital does not diminish by waiting. Time unsold cannot be brought to market a second time. It perishes in postponement. Mr. Thornton, in his elaborate book on "Labour," defends the opinion that in Great Britain the majority of the strikes, both on a rising and a falling market, have succeeded. Certain it is that the average of wages in trades where strikes are frequent has been raised in the last fifty years—if not by strikes, then by the fear of them. Very often, when manufacturers do not yield at the time of a strike, they raise wages afterwards. Strikes have probably succeeded in the majority of cases on a rising market, and yet they are the most barbaric of all the weapons that labour employs.

Are trades-unions a nursery of socialism?

Go to Chicago, go to the door of Tremont Temple, and you may purchase socialistic newspapers of a type of which this is a specimen. [Holding up a newspaper.] In this official socialistic sheet nearly half a page is taken up with a trades-union directory. "Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners," "Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers," "Miners' National Association," "Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen,"—these are a few out of scores of titles reprinted every week in this sheet.

I turn to the official announcement of the object of the paper, and find that "*The Socialist* will record the proceedings of all trades-unions, especially of amalgamated and centralised unions, whenever sent us. We shall discuss all the various phases of the labour movements. We expect all unions and sections, as well as individual members, throughout the country, to promptly send us reports and items upon all matters of importance to the labour cause."

What is the socialistic platform? In this country it is somewhat altered in shape from the form it has in the Old World; but here is the platform which this paper prints in connection with these lists

of trades-unions: "We demand that the resources of life—the means of production, public transportation, and communication (land, machinery, railroads, telegraph lines, canals, etc.)—become, as fast as practicable, the common property of the whole people, through the government; thus to abolish the wages system, and substitute in its stead co-operative production, with a just distribution of its rewards."

Why have I insisted so on education for working-men? Why have I insisted, as if on a question of life or death, on the rights of factory children? Why have I been taking your time by giving reasons for the execution of the school laws which provide for compulsory education? Because, if trades-unions are filled with an ignorant set of working-men, socialistic doctrines will take root in that soil. The results of socialism in the United States, were it to spread here, would be more disastrous than in Germany, simply because popular suffrage on the Hudson and the Mississippi has more power than on the Elbe and the Oder. The truth is that trades-unions, all over the United States, are seeking political power; and are, therefore, likely to be frequently under temptation to form alliance with socialistic labour parties. American trades-unions are now not socialistic; but let an ignorant hereditary operative class come into existence here, and they may easily fall a prey to socialistic demagogues. Once give socialists in the United States a majority of votes, and you will speedily learn the distinction between voluntary and compulsory socialism. An unforced agreement of men to go into a socialistic community is one thing; compulsory socialism is another. Under universal suffrage, with political power gathered into the hands of working-men, who were seventy or eighty out of every hundred of the voters, there may come a time when socialism, instead of being voluntary, will be compulsory, and nationalization of the lands, the railroads, the canals, the telegraphs, be forced upon you by a vote of an ignorant population. Compulsory socialism is the chief danger in the future of universal suffrage, and from that peril, which means nothing less than spoliation and anarchy, may God (and discussion in the church and state) save us!

SOCIALISM AND UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

Prelude.—Infidelity and Infamous Literature.

In the city of Berne, in Switzerland, there is a statue of a hideous ogre eating a child. The pockets of the monster are filled with girls and boys, waiting for the crackling of their bones and the extraction of their marrow between the teeth of the cannibal. The ghastly figure is a fit representation of the god which American infidelity, in clamourously demanding the repeal of all laws against the infamous use of the mails, has lately set up for public worship. The leprous cannibal fiend, more odious than Astarte and more cruel than Baal, is correctly described by the name Cancer Planter. It is a matter of public notoriety that, according to the testimony of an alarmed and protesting minority, a large majority of the National Liberal League of Infidels have formally entered the service of this god of the slimiest part of the Pit. Their lecturers and newspapers are his hierophants. The youth of the land, so far as he can reach them, are between his teeth. Unspeakably loathsome and abominable men and women, whose trade is the corruption of the young, dare to petition Congress in the name of a free press to abolish all laws against a debauched use of the mails—that is, to allow this fiend to reach his prey without let or hindrance. A majority of the National Liberal League of Infidels second their desire. The greed of the pocket and the greed of the teeth are combined.

1. Of course, it is evident, even to a mind uneducated in the law, that there must be a federal regulation concerning the use of the mails, if we are to keep the United States government itself from assisting moral cancer planters. Whoever sells infamous publications in any state of the American Union becomes amenable to the laws of that state. If, however, a ghoul of the slums sends his wares from one state to another by the mails, it is in most cases difficult or impossible to convict him under the laws of either. Even when the laws allow such conviction, it usually becomes impracticable on account of the difficulty of proof and of ferreting out and securing the offender. Vendors of infamous literature, therefore, do their business as much as possible through the mails. Purify the post-office from this traffic, and you confine it to comparatively narrow limits. The shield of state rights is greatly coveted by the corrupters of youth, and their scheme is to clamour against any federal regulation as to the transmission of their wares through the mails.

2. In 1873 Congress passed an excellent law forbidding vendors of infamous literature to tamper with the national mails, and appointing an efficient postal expert, especially charged with the duty of exposing the violators of the statute.

3. It is highly significant that nobody complained and nobody thought of complaining of the law except infidels, free religionists, and corrupt publishers.

A petition was sent to Congress in 1878 in favour of the repeal of the postal law of 1873. The New York agent of the Society for the Prevention of Vice was very much surprised to see in the list of signatures to it the names of several important firms who had usually been his friends. He asked these personally if it was indeed true that they had petitioned for the repeal of the regulations of 1873. "We have never put our names down on any such petition," was the reply. "Are you willing to say so in writing?" They were, of course, not unwilling

to place themselves outside the black ranks of those who had signed this petition, and the leading firms gave him written authority to say that their names on the document were forgeries. He appeared before a committee of Congress with this evidence, and in a very short speech defeated the petition. In New York so much forgery of this kind is done that the procedure is regarded as an old trick, and if public attention has not been called to it through newspaper discussion, it is because fraud of the sort has been so frequently attempted by corrupt publishers and infidel societies in large cities.

An official document, in which a committee of Congress recommends that the postal laws of 1873 should not be changed, now lies before me, and I must quote it, although it contains, as a fly in amber and in the evil conspicuity of an irreversible public record, the name of the foremost infidel lecturer in the United States:

"Forty-fifth Congress, Second Session—House of Representatives—
Report No. 888.

Repeal of certain sections of the Revised Statutes. May 31st, 1878, laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

"Mr. Bicknell, from the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on the Revision of the Laws, to whom was referred the petition of *Robert G. Ingersoll* and others, praying for the repeal or modification of sections 1,785, 3,878, 3,893, 5,389, and 2,491 of the Revised Statutes, have had the same under consideration and have heard the petitioners at length.

"*In the opinion of your Committee, the post-office was not established to carry instruments of vice or obscene writings, indecent pictures, or lewd books.*

"Your Committee believe that the statutes in question do not violate the Constitution of the United States and ought not to be changed. They recommend, therefore, that the prayer of said petition be denied."

The unimpeachable authority of this document shows what was asked for, and who asked for it, and why it was not granted.

Under the law of 1873 it is impossible to prevent the sending of corrupt matter from state to state, or by mail at all. If you can only execute the federal law against the corrupt use of the mails, you can do much to confine the corrupting of youth to cities. You have legislation connecting commonwealth with commonwealth, and interstate in all its operations. The execution of this most necessary and righteous federal law is what pinches cancer planters; and it is of that, or of that chiefly, that they make complaint.

4. In Boston, in November, 1877, there was an infamous convention of a Lepers' League, at Nassau Hall. In the course of its proceedings a woman, not a lady, who was the wife of a man recently pardoned out of Dedham Jail, stood at the front of the platform, and in the presence of two hundred men and boys disgraced herself by language which cannot be reported here and could not be indicated even distantly without giving great offence. One of the friends of the law of 1873 happened to be in the audience and went out for a policeman; and when the president of the gang who were governing that convention—some of them ex-convicts, some of them sellers of corrupt literature—appeared in the ante-room, he was arrested. On learning the news, even that audience heartily applauded. He was tried, and, as you know, sent to Dedham Jail. There was

a very full discussion of his case. Judge Clark first decided against him. The character of the paper he had been publishing at Princeton, in this state, was brought forward as one evidence of his moral character. He advertised to sell a book, the name of which I shall not advertise by mentioning it, and called for "agents—girls and women particularly successful." The publication demands the abrogation of all laws against infamous crimes. It preaches the "natural right of man to commit adultery." The woman who made the speech to which I have alluded has herself, in this city, boasted of being a convert to her husband's doctrines.

It was claimed that the law under which this criminal was convicted was unconstitutional. Delay was requested, and the judge presiding at the trial postponed the final disposal of the case until Judge Clifford, the senior justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, could be here and assist in determining that question. After full consideration, both judges decided that the law was clearly constitutional.* By the concurrence of both of them, the defendant, on the 25th of June last, was sent to Dedham Jail for two years' hard work, and fined 100 dollars.

He was not in vigorous health. The newspaper statement was that it was feared that he would die in jail. Some of the persons who started the forged petition in New York City started another. One or two criminals who have been in prison in New York and New Jersey came to Boston as drummers, and by forgery or by a very vigorous canvass among persons of their own opinions they obtained a petition, which it is claimed had 7,000 signatures, asking for the release of this criminal from Dedham Jail.

At the instigation of the cancer-planter gang, items were published saying that Judge Clifford had signed the petition. He has denied this charge, in a letter over his own name.

It is exceedingly unusual for a criminal to be pardoned without reference being made to the judge who sentenced him. Go to the lawyers who are acquainted with this case, and you will find them expressing indignation on account of the abandonment of all established usages in the granting of this pardon. Never but once before has any criminal convicted in this federal court been pardoned without reference of the case back from Washington to the authorities here for the facts. It is a wholly unwarranted abuse of the pardoning power to discharge a criminal with no effort to hear both sides.

Judge Clifford's decision could have been supported by a most significant petition, if only time had been allowed. The proper department at Washington was informed of this fact. Who ever heard before of a pardon being granted a criminal who avowed no penitence, but said he would repeat his offence?

The decision of Judge Clifford was a very mild one. I have the text of it in my hands. The penalty fixed by Congress was a fine of not less than one hundred nor more than five thousand dollars, and imprisonment for not less than one year and not more than ten years. In view of all the circumstances, since it was the first offence, and since the defendant could not be sentenced to the state-prison with the hope that the offence would not be repeated, the court gave a sentence of which you have heard through the public prints and which was approved by all the respectable press of this city. "The spirit of the law," said Judge Clifford, "is for the protection of the community, and the court cannot overlook the community in passing the sentence."

---

* See *Daily Advertiser*, leading article, July 31st, 1878.

It is said that Attorney-General Devens was imposed upon. No time was given for another petition. Cancer-planters had the ear of the pardoning power and filled it with lies. It was supposed that nothing lacking in respectability could come from Boston. Perhaps the good name of Boston and the fear that the criminal would die in jail were the chief influences causing his liberation. The management of the petition was in New York more than in Boston, and chiefly in the hands, in both places, of ex-convicts, whose imprisonment was inflicted for the violation of the United States postal laws.

The editor of a New York sheet, a copy of which lies here and which I will not name, is pecuniarily interested in the sale of this infamous volume, which has been discussed by the courts and pronounced a criminal book. He was one of the leaders of the petition to effect the release of the author of that book who is pecuniarily interested in its sale. The woman who went to Washington to urge this petition was once notorious as a friend of that Victoria who is at the bottom of her sex. This is very frank speech, my friends; but there is a public necessity for candour on this theme. If you do not care to be responsible for what is said here, I do, and am entirely willing to take all the blows that may come.

5. It is an Arabian legend that when the ostrich was told to carry a load it replied, "I cannot. I am a bird"; and when it was told to fly it replied, "I cannot. I am a camel." It is also an Arabian legend that when the rats were taxed the bat said, "I am a bird"; and when the birds were taxed the bat said, "I am a rat." The National Liberal League says it is not the Free Religious Association; and the Free Religious Association says it is not the National Liberal League. I have been taken to task by what calls itself cultured free thought for not making a distinction between these two bodies. I did make a distinction. I was perfectly aware that they are two organizations, and that they are no more nearly connected than father and son. Nevertheless, I did apply the epithet "free religious" to the majority of the National Liberal Leagues, who clamour for the abrogation of the righteous postal laws of our nation. Why did I do that? Because I was officially authorized to do so. I open the infidel newspaper which thinks I have blundered, and I read that this journal is "devoted to free religion." This is the language of its prospectus. Well, if a newspaper announces that it is devoted to the interests of the Republican party, is it not a Republican newspaper? If it affirms that its purpose is to advance the interests of the Democratic party, is it not a Democratic paper? And if it says in its prospectus, as this paper does, that its object is to promote free religion, is it not a free religious paper? Is it not perfectly fair to call it such? This same prospectus says: "In addition to its general objects, the practical object to which this paper is specially devoted is the organization of the Liberals of the country. . . . This paper will henceforth have for its chief practical aim the organization of a great national party of freedom." It is perfectly well understood that the local leagues constituting the National Liberal League were organized chiefly through the discussions contained in this sheet. If, now, a Democratic paper says that its chief object is to organize leagues, I conclude that these leagues when organized by a Democratic paper will be Democratic leagues. If a Republican paper announces that its chief business is to found leagues, I conclude that it means Republican leagues. So, when a paper which is devoted to free religion announces that its chief work is to form leagues, I must infer that these leagues when formed will be free religious leagues, and defy any man who is straightforward to question my right to do so.

No connection, indeed, between free religion and the National Liberal Leagues! Several of the officers of the two associations are the same. Here are the reports

of the Free Religious Association itself. I open the report for 1874, and find the committee of the Free Religious Association using the following very significant language (p. 15):

"This is specially a report of what has been done by your committee during the past year in behalf of the principles for which the Free Religious Association was organized. But we can hardly forbear mentioning other signs of activity in the same general direction, though outside of their immediate proceedings, and which help to mark the year as one of progress; as, for instance, *the organization of some twenty or more liberal leagues* in different parts of the country, the starting of several local free religious societies for Sunday meetings, the building of the new and elegant hall by the old Free Society at Florence, the dedication of the fine Parker Memorial building in Boston."

These movements are all closely affiliated. The publications of the National League and of the Free Religious Association are sold in Boston from the same street number. On the same page with the language I have just cited is another statement too significant to be overlooked. An assistant editor of the paper which has founded the leagues is named. It is said of him that he "has generously and faithfully had charge of the sales-table and responded to such orders for our publications as have been sent to the office, and for this painstaking service he deserves the gratitude of our Association. *The office, being up three flights of stairs, is too difficult of access for entire satisfaction;* yet, notwithstanding this disadvantage, has already proved itself a great convenience, not to say necessity, and, all things considered, very well answers the present needs of the Association."

Of course, I know the Free Religious Association, as such, refused to send representatives to a convention of Liberal Leagues at Philadelphia. I know there have been protests by individuals in the Free Religious Association against the action of the majority at Syracuse. I know very well that there is a minority who now assert that the majority has gone over to the worship of the cannibal god.

The history of Free Religion in the United States is so suggestive that we must not permit the story to be thrown into confusion by any use of the tactics condemned in the Arabian legends. The glory of our country, it is pretended, is likely to be injured by legislation against the freedom of the press and of speech. We want free speech, free press, free mails, the editor of an infidel paper in Boston says. And if he gets them, if our civilization is once Gallicized, once Romanized, in the old corrupt sense, out of free mails will come I do not know what: but in old Rome free poison came out of them and free daggers! American civilization is not so sweet that we can be easily wheedled into speaking of a mild and gentle assassination or a pious devil. The gauze of reverence for free speech thrown over the cannibal god, Cancer Planter, this ogre, eating the youth of the land, is so thin that, like the gauzes worn in India, twenty of them would not make a decent veil.

6. Go to the superb scholar who is at the head of the highest school for girls in Boston, and he will tell you that his institution publishes no catalogue, and for the same reason that the resplendent school I cited here the other day publishes none. Correspondence received in seminaries of certain grades is often examined before it can be safely delivered. I was told the other day by a lady who had just passed through a female seminary that she thought it a great hardship that her mail was examined. It was not always opened; but it was sometimes. There was a right to open it, and the parents justified the arrangements. Facts like these make the blood run cold.

7. Nothing can be done, you say? In two hundred cases where arrests have been made only five have failed, so perfect has been the evidence and so are juries united. More than three-quarters of the infamous publications once on sale have been driven utterly out of the market. Nothing can be done? Why this cannibal god can be buried under the mud, if you please, as the old Germans buried the adulterer alive! It is our duty to bury him so deep that he will be out of the reach of the spades of all those of his gang who pretend to be moved solely by reverence for free speech and a free press. I undertake to say to those here who respect free religion that, if they wish to prove their free religion to be literally and strictly free irreligion, they have only to go on in the course which has been pursued by the majority of the infidel liberal leagues of this country for the last twelve months. The minority is the witness against the majority.

8. On the part of the Boston free religious newspaper which has founded the liberal leagues, there has been any amount of clucking, as from a brood hen, to draw her young chickens under her wings again; but with all her clucking in the last two months since the separation at Syracuse, she has got only five chickens under her wings—that is, only five out of some seventy-five local leagues. And all the rest, according to her own confession, are brooded by the black angels.

I read in this Boston infidel sheet that the criminal lately pardoned out of Dedham Jail, and who asserts his natural right to commit adultery, has a heavy account to settle with the conscience of the community. Thank God that a little sense has been left to the small and timorous infidel minority! But as to the liberal leagues which this editor denounces, one of the foremost literary men, who was once friendly to the Free Religious Association, said to me: "They are all his own chickens."

On the list of officers of the Free Religious Association are the names of several men who are supposed to be ashamed of their position. Even Mr. Frothingham has lately said that he does not care to be represented any longer in any such way as will make him responsible for what the majority of these liberal leagues may do. He is, perhaps, as radical a person as there is among any men known to the public on these lists of officers; but he is not radical enough to strike hands with quack doctors, and the publishers of corrupt literature, and cancer planters recently from jail, and who stand before the nation offering incense to the cannibal god. The fact I emphasize, however, is that the overwhelming majority are of utterly different opinions and are having their own way.

9. There is little serious opposition now by the feeble infidel minority to that infidel majority which the minority itself has denounced as corrupt.

10. Out of free religion has grown free irreligion, and out of infidel liberalism immorality.

When I was younger than I am now, I was much impressed by certain words of Henry Ward Beecher on corrupters of youth.* Time has emphasized these syllables:

"There is no such thing as good corrupters. We denounce them. For it is our nature to loathe perfidious corruption. We have no compunction to withhold us. We mourn over a torn and bleeding lamb; but who mourns the wolf which rent it? We weep for despoiled innocence; but who sheds a tear for the savage fiend who plucks away the flower of virtue? The downfall of youth is our sorrow; but for their destroyers, for the *corrupters of youth*, who practice the infernal chemistry of ruin and dissolve the young heart in vice, we have neither tears, nor

* "Lectures to Young Men," edition of 1846, pp. 250, 251.

pleas, nor patience. We lift our hearts to Him who beareth the rod of vengeance and pray for the appointed time of judgment. Ye miscreants! Think ye that ye are growing tall and walking safely because God hath forgotten? The wrath shall yet smite you! You shall be heard as the falling of an oak in the silent forest—the vaster its growth the more terrible its resounding downfall! Oh! thou *corrupter of youth!* I would not take thy death for all the pleasure of thy guilty life a thousandfold. Thou shalt draw near to the shadow of death. To the Christian these shades are the golden haze which Heaven's light makes when it meets the earth and mingles with its shadows. But to thee these shall be shadows full of phantom shapes. Images of terror in the future shall dimly rise and beckon; the ghostly deeds of the past shall stretch out their skinny hands to push thee forward. Thou shalt not die unattended. Despair shall mock thee. Agony shall tender to thy parched lips the fiery cup. Remorse shall feel for thy heart and rend it open. Good men shall breathe freer at thy death and utter thanksgiving when thou art gone. Men shall place thy gravestone as a monument and testimony that a plague is stayed. No tear shall wet it, no mourner linger there. And as, borne on the blast, thy guilty spirit whistles toward the gate of Hell, the hideous shrieks of those whom thy hand hath destroyed shall pierce thee—Hell's first welcome! In the bosom of that everlasting storm which rains perpetual misery in Hell shalt thou, *corrupter of youth*, be for ever hidden from our view; and may God wipe out the very thought of thee from our memory."

The Lecture.

Henry IV. of France once said, and the remark has been gratefully remembered for two hundred years, that he hoped the day would come when every peasant in his kingdom might have, as often as he pleased, a chicken for dinner. If there is a political ruler in the civilized part of the world who would not say this now, he is as much an exception to the drift of the age and to the tendencies of history for the last two hundred years as the Gulf Stream is an exception to the general drift of the Atlantic. But when Henry IV. said this, the speech was a very singular one for a great ruler to make. Everything in history for the last two centuries illustrates God's pity for the poor and the progress of democratic ideas. When every peasant can have, as often as he pleases, a chicken for dinner, will not both the pauper and the millionaire be improved off the face of the earth? So thinks Socialism; and if God thinks so the result will be accomplished. What He thinks we find out after he has acted; and De Tocqueville said He regarded the progress of democratic principles in government as a providential fact, the result of a divine decree. It was universal. It was enduring. It was irresistible. All men and all events contributed to its progress. He found in it the sacred characteristics of a providential fact, and, although not given to superstition, stood in awe before this current in history. But the progress of democratic ideas is only one illustration of God's pity for the poor. The day has come, for nearly the whole world that can be called civilized, when to say what Henry IV. said is to say nothing singular.

It is evident that if the growth of socialistic political parties is to be fostered by the growth of popular intelligence and democratic

ideas in government, then the success of socialistic parties is certain. You think I am making a careless concession; but I am no Socialist. You think that the necessary result of the progress of intelligence among the masses and of democratic ideas in government must bring Socialism to the front in our political organizations. Professor Fawcett, in opening his present course of lectures at Oxford, said that if the growth of the socialistic political vote progressed in Germany and in the United States for the next fifty years as it has for the last fifty, capital can do nothing effectual against Socialism. You notice how parts of this audience are aflame with the opinions of Socialists, which I am perfectly willing should be expressed here. I shall not answer these pistol-shots except by artillery at long range. I have discussed labour; and because I have been on the side of labour reform you may have thought that I am on the side of Socialism. I admit, with Professor Fawcett, that the growth of the socialistic political vote is very ominous, and that trouble surely lies ahead of us if the growth continues to be as rapid as it has been; but I do not see that the great current which put De Tocqueville in awe floats Socialism. I see that it floats the cause of the poor, and because I am a defender of the latter I am against the former.

What are the fundamental principles of American socialistic parties? Heretofore I have allowed our discussions to include Europe; but in order to be definite, I must now draw your attention exclusively to the United States.

A distinction is to be made between the ultimate purposes and the preparatory measures of Socialists seeking political power. I have conversed with many Socialists, with many working men, and with some leaders of trades-unions; and I find that nearly all who are endeavouring to promote socialistic measures, or labour reform, through politics, know very well the distinction between the thin end and thick end of the wedge. In Europe this distinction is well understood, and it ill becomes the discussion of this platform to fail in emphasizing a distinction which the Socialistic Labour Party in this country itself proclaims. I drew the other day a distinction between radicals, ringleaders, ultra men in socialistic ranks, and the average Socialist. I told you that thoroughgoing Socialism means the abolition of inheritance, the abolition of the family, and ultimately the abolition of religion in any decent sense of the word; and all these propositions can be proved from the public positions taken in Europe by ringleaders. The most ultimate purposes of all are little discussed here as yet. A set of purposes just this side of these ultimate ones is publicly proposed; but the preparatory measures are the chief matters really discussed.

The ultimate purposes of socialistic political parties in the United States are, according to their own statement:

1. Abolition of inheritance of land or any other means of production —such as machinery, railroads, telegraph lines, and canals.
2. Abolition of private property in land or any other means of the production of wealth.
3. Abolition of the wages system.
4. Abolition of the competitive system.
5. National ownership of all land and other means of production.
6. Governmental aid to co-operative associations.
7. A graded income-tax.
8. Paper currency or fiat money.

After having read many Socialistic platforms, in German and French and English, I have selected that of the Socialistic Labour Party of the United States as the most definite and candid of them all. I offer the text of it in proof of the correctness of my distinction between the ultimate purposes and the preparatory measures of Socialism, and of the justice of the analysis I have given of the ends at which the movement aims. This document, which I can read here only in part, but which will be printed in full in the authorized report of this lecture, is a curious sign of the times, and deserves study in detail. I quote it as it stands every week in *The Socialist*, of Chicago.

"PLATFORM OF THE SOCIALISTIC LABOUR PARTY.

"Labour being the source of all wealth and civilization, and useful labour being possible only by and through the associated efforts of the people, the means of labour should, therefore, in all justice, belong to society.

"The system under which society is now organized is imperfect and hostile to the general welfare, since, through it, the directors of labour, necessarily a small minority, are enabled in the competitive struggle to practically monopolize all the means of labour—all opportunities to produce for and supply the wants of the people; and the masses are, therefore, maintained in poverty and dependence. The industrial emancipation of labour (which must be achieved by the working classes themselves, independent of all political parties but their own) is, consequently, the great end to which every political movement should be subordinate as a means.

"Since the ruling political parties have always sought only the direct interests of the dominant or wealthy class, and endeavoured to uphold their industrial supremacy and to perpetuate the present condition of society, it is now the duty of the working people to organize themselves into one great labour party, using political power to achieve industrial independence. The material condition of the

working people in all civilized countries being identical and resulting from the same cause, the struggle for industrial emancipation is international, and must naturally be co-operative and mutual; therefore the organization of national and international trades and labour unions upon a socialistic basis is an absolute necessity.

"For these reasons the Socialistic Labour Party has been founded.

"We demand that the resources of life—the means of production, public transportation, and communication (land, machinery, railroads, telegraph lines, canals, etc.)—become, as fast as practicable, the common property of the whole people, through the Government, thus to abolish the wages system, and substitute in its stead co-operative production, with a just distribution of its rewards.

"The Socialistic Labour Party presents the following demands as measures to ameliorate the working-people under our present competitive system, and to gradually accomplish the entire removal of the same:

"1. Eight hours, for the present, as the legal working-day, and prompt punishment for all violations.

"2. Sanitary inspection of all conditions of labour (means of subsistence and dwellings included).

"3. Bureaus of labour statistics in all states, as well as in the National Government. The officers of the same to be elected by the people.

"4. Prohibition of the use of prison labour by private employers or corporations.

"5. Prohibition of the employment of children under fourteen years of age in industrial establishments.

"6. Compulsory education of all children under fourteen years of age. All materials, books, etc., necessary in the public schools to be furnished free of charge.

"7. Prohibition of the employment of female labour in occupations detrimental to health or morality; and equalization of women's wages with those of men where equal service is performed.

"8. Strict laws making employers liable for all accidents resulting, through their negligence, to the injury of their employés.

"9. All wages to be paid in the lawful money of the nation, and at intervals of time not exceeding one week. Violations of this rule to be legally punished.

"10. All conspiracy laws operating against the right of workingmen to strike or to induce others to strike shall be repealed.

"11. Gratuitous administration of justice in all courts of law.

"12. All indirect taxation to be abolished, and a graded income-tax to be collected in its stead.

"13. All banking and insurance to be conducted by the Government.

"14. The right of suffrage shall in no wise be abridged.

"15. Direct popular legislation, enabling the people to propose or reject any law at their will; and introduction of minority representation in all legislative elections.

"16. Every public officer shall be, at all times, subject to prompt recall by the election of a successor."

Professor Fawcett, last October, at the University at Oxford, summarized the demands of European Socialism; and I think it a part of my duty, as an outlook committee, to cite his language, in contrast with this American document:

"After having carefully examined the proposals of the leading German Socialists, and after having read the proceedings of the various socialistic congresses which have been held in recent years, I think it will be admitted that the following is a full and fair statement of the programme of modern Socialism:

"1. That there should be no private property, and that no one should be permitted to acquire property by inheritance. That all should be compelled to labour, no one having a right to live without labour.

"2. The nationalization of the land and of the other instruments of production; or, in other words, the state should own all the land, capital, machinery — in fact, everything which constitutes the industrial plant of a country—in order that every industry may be carried on by the state.

"These proposals to prohibit inheritance, to abolish private property, and to make the state the owner of all the capital and the administrator of the entire industry of the country, are put forward as representing Socialism in its ultimate and highest development. The Socialists themselves admit that, as there is no immediate prospect of obtaining their objects in a complete form, it will be desirable to put forward proposals which involve a less fundamental change; and the following may, consequently, be regarded as the objects to be first striven for. These objects are regarded as not only desirable in themselves, but are looked upon as facilitating the complete realization of the socialistic idea:

"1. The establishment of co-operative agricultural and manufacturing associations, supported by the state.

"2. Universal, compulsory, and free education.

"3. A progressive income-tax and the abolition of indirect taxation.

"4. The limitation by the state of the length of the day's work.

"5. The sanitary inspection of mines, factories, and workmen's dwellings.

"6. The state should find work for the unemployed, by constructing public works, the necessary funds being supplied by an unlimited issue of paper money."

The nationalization of the land is the great measure of Socialism. It was the demand of the International Association before its practical disbandment; and to-day it is the ground work on which most of the purposes of Socialism, when it forms itself into a political phalanx, are founded. Do I mean to say that if Socialists have a majority at the polls the land will be nationalized by a vote compelling the

spoliation of our agricultural class? Do I mean to affirm that there is not a distinction between compulsory Socialism and that kind of Socialism which may come in America when Socialists have a majority? My reply to these questions is that nobody knows what will happen in the future, except from the instruction of what has happened in the past. For one, I do not think that the sober socialistic leaders —if there are any—really contemplate spoliation in this country. They very rarely, when interrogated in private, will admit that they think land can be taken from its present owners and nationalized, without compensation. You are often told that Socialism means nationalization of the land, and that nobody is to be paid for it; but I suppose there would be a pretence of payment. There might be about such payment, perhaps, as a railway makes when it must buy land to have freedom for traffic. There will be compulsory sale of land, railways, canals, machinery, and other means of production, if the majority ever become Socialists in this country.

How is money to be obtained to pay for this compulsory sale? Why, out of a graded income-tax. That is the next great proposition. That means the abolition of all indirect taxation. According to the size of a man's income will be the amount of the tax he pays. If you are economical, industrious, and fortunate enough to have an income of a thousand dollars, you will be taxed twice as much as a man whose income is only five hundred. The scheme of many Socialists is to make the increase of the income-tax much faster than the increase of fortune, so that great fortunes shall be discouraged. If you should ever be so fortunate as to have an income of twenty thousand dollars, you would probably find it for your interest not to have an income of more than fifteen thousand. Under a graded income-tax, eating up large fortunes, and under denial of all right of inheritance, men would soon find it for their interest to have no income at all, and pay only a poll-tax. Production would thus be hamstrung.

A graded income-tax, however, is the source from which socialistic philosophers think of getting their money to buy—what? Why, all the land from Plymouth Rock to the Golden Gate! How much money would be required to buy this from its present possessors? A good deal more than our present national income. How are you going to get money to pay for it out of a graded income-tax? Here is the first rock against which socialistic philosophy splinters itself. Let us suppose that there is a proposition to buy all the land of England, a little island over yonder in the sea. Professor Fawcett has shown that the money which would be needed to pay for that

land would be more than the present income of the United Kingdom, although that income is a thousand million pounds annually.

The interest on the money required to buy the land of the United States from its present individual owners would be more than the present income of the nation. You could not raise the interest! If you should try to negotiate any such immense loan, you would find business men staring at you, even if you were in a majority. If you purpose to borrow money to pay for the lands of the United States, they would ask how you are to divide and occupy the lands? How are you to distribute the farms, after you have bought them? Here is Utah. You must water the territory to make it profitable. Who will go to Utah, and who will stay in the fat valley of the Mississippi? No competition. Who will be called upon to divide the land among the people, so many square feet a head? Who will take the task of deciding where the poor lands are and where the rich lands are, and how much lands are to be increased in price by nearness to great commercial centres? *Will there be any jobbery in your politics when you have all the lands of the nation to dispose of?* Jobbery! Corruption! Tyranny! These are the tusks of the reefs lying at the bottom of the socialistic political whirlpool. God deliver the world from setting the cause of the poor afloat on any current running into that maëlstrom! When the sea is calm, the tusks of jobbery, patronage, greed, and fraud jut through the foam, and can be seen above the whirlpool from afar.

Henry Wilson stood on this platform, a few years ago, and said that if the cause of prohibition was to go up in Massachusetts, he proposed to go up with it; and if it was to go down, he proposed to go down with it. Soon after that speech was delivered a presidential election occurred, and the German vote in several of the Western States came near defeating the Republican candidate. I do not impeach Mr. Wilson's patriotism; no man reveres Henry Wilson more than I; but it is one of the secrets of politics in Massachusetts that Mr. Wilson, after he saw how disaffection in the German vote in the West might turn a presidential election, advised the Republicans in the East not to weight their platforms with the advocacy of prohibition. Only a few stretches of disaffected political sentiment in the Mississippi Valley made callow and limp the most stalwart statesman of the East on the topic of prohibition. You say that even under universal suffrage and lax laws as to education there is no danger in the United States from Socialism as a political power. But let a few patches of foreign-born populations in the Mississippi Valley, in Chicago, in St. Louis, San Francisco, be affected by these political heresies in such

a way that their vote as a makeweight may imperil a presidential election, and who will get even the leading political parties to stand erect under that danger? It need not be that you should wait until Socialism has carried a state. You need not wait until it has a majority in the lower branches of several state legislatures. You will find that political parties of the average orthodoxy in the East and West will need vertebrating the moment there is a socialistic vote so large as to imperil a presidential election when closely contested.

SOCIALISM A POLITICAL BLUNDER.

Prelude—Commercial Honour.

Spots on the sun are said to cause commercial panics ; but in that dismal business, which are the most effective, the spots on the sun or those on the sun behind the sun ?

For more than 200 years seasons of business depression have occurred with mysterious regularity at periods of ten years and a fraction. In Great Britain and Western Europe there were business manias and bursting commercial bubbles, producing great depression, in 1743, 1753, 1763, 1773, 1783, and 1793. In this century, if you take into view the United States, as well as Great Britain, France, and Germany, you find commercial depressions occurring in 1815, 1825, 1835 to 1839, 1845, 1855, and 1866. Although we had an exception to the rule in our depression of 1873, Great Britain is now, in 1878-9, passing through a period of great financial distress. It has amused the world to find grave political economists attributing the recurrence of these depressions to the influence of the spots on the sun, in producing droughts in India and unfruitful vineyards in Europe. It is certain that good vintage years on the Continent of Europe and droughts in India recur every ten or eleven years. It seem probable to no less a man than Professor Stanley Jevons that commercial crises are connected with periodic variations of theweather , affectingall parts of the earth, and arising from increased waves of heat received from the sun at average intervals of ten years and a fraction.*

An abundant supply of the sun's heat increases the harvests and begins the hopefulness out of which a commercial bubble grows. A diminished supply injures the harvests, deranges commercial enterprise, and so bursts the bubble. What are called credit cycles last, therefore, about ten years. The first three years generally exhibit depression ; then you have three years of healthy trade ; and then comes say two years of excited trade. Your ninth year is a bubble, and your tenth year is its explosion and collapse. The best time to invest money is, of course, during the period of depression. It will not do to put your money into the same business that everybody is going into, for there will be too many people doing that one thing, and so much overproduction in the business that goods drawn from it will be cheap. Buy your factories at the time of depression, when they can be had at half their cost. Avoid following the example of Sir Isaac Newton, who endeavoured to purchase stock in the South Sea Bubble on the day when that speculation was at its highest. Observe the good vintage years in Europe and the droughts in India, and regulate your relations to periods of business depression accordingly. This is the wisdom of those who find the chief cause of commercial panics in spots on the physical sun.

It is our business to study not only the spots on the sun, but those also which impede the light of the sun behind the sun. One would think in view of the corruptions of modern trade, that the latter are far more efficient than the former in producing commercial crises. What is the first spot on the sun behind the sun

* "Primer of Political Economy," 1878.

of modern civilization ? Why, the growth of our great cities, and the fact that large towns usually lose the Master's whip of small cords. Cities easily forget how to hiss vice. Too many churches are brought under the influence of the average standards of the great commercial centres. I believe that the press of our chief cities is not as indignant as the average sentiment of the country-side concerning defalcations, bankruptcies, and the unscrupulous sharpness which so undermines credit. It is true the laws of trade are understood in the cities better than in the country-side ; but so many dishonest things are done in the great towns that the average merchant, even the average editor, sometimes the average preacher, contents himself by saying, when he hears of business dishonesty, that it is an old trick. Swindles are the newspapers' daily food. The tone of public discussion is thus relaxed. When honesty is unexacting there comes into existence what I call a grinning and a flabby commercial liberalism—the most costly mood that commerce can put on. You all know that as often as failures occur credits are injured. We are suspicious of each other in proportion to the number of frauds and dishonest bankruptcies. Distrust makes necessary a higher rate of interest. "The costliest, unclean beast," Thorold Rogers says, "that society can keep in its menagerie is an unpunished commercial rogue."

In the growth of great cities there is a deteriorating effect, not only for average mercantile sentiment, but for legislation itself. Look at the Bankruptcy Law of the United States. Congress has power to make a uniform law concerning bankruptcies; but how much have we felt that power in the United States ? In France, commercial panics are very few ; and you will find the business honour of that nation expressed in severe bankrupt law. Napoleon had something to do, in his famous code, with making it. And even Englishmen regard the French bankrupt law as cautious beyond measure, unsparing, and even tyrannical. Bankruptcies are so dishonourable in France that very often a bankrupt will leave his native city in order not to be obliged to face the men he has swindled. Sometimes he leaves his native country, even when he has failed through no great fault of his own. French public sentiment is so unflinchingly against a man who acquires the name of bankrupt, either by rash speculation or by purposed commercial mischief, that it has been known again and again that a son would submit to the most pinching poverty for years, practising more than the proverbial French thrift, in order to take a stain off the name of a father. It has not been unknown that a father in France has pined away and died because of the accidental bankruptcy of a son. Say, if you please, that all this is carrying the matter too far. It remains true that panics are few in France, although the spots on the physical sun affect her as much as us. France has paid an enormous fine with a rapidity unknown in any similar case in past history, and the best hope for that republic to-day is her high commercial honour.

What have we done with our power to pass a national bankrupt law ? Why, in 1800 we enacted a bankrupt law limiting itself to five years' operations ; but it was repealed in three years. Of course, there are state bankrupt laws ; but they are suspended wherever a national bankrupt law is in force. The state laws on bankruptcies are not all alike ; nor are all of them good ones. By emigrating from commonwealth to commonwealth, and getting local lawyers to defend you, it is possible for you to make your bankruptcy a relief from honest debts, unless you come under the power of a federal bankrupt law. We ran along at odds and ends, doing nothing with our national power concerning a bankrupt law, until 1841, when a second law was passed. This was largely in the interests of the debtor class created by the panic of 1837. It was repealed a few years afterwards, and we ran on then at odds and ends again until 1867; and then the third bank-

rupt law of the United States was passed. This was modified somewhat in 1874; but it was the last one. Anybody whose property is worth over three hundred dollars can declare himself unable to pay his debts and take the benefit of the law, putting his assets at the mercy of his creditors. The law makes no discrimination among the creditors. It was passed in the interest of the debtor class. It is more popular with creditors than no law would be; but business men and lawyers complain of many of its operations. What I complain of is that Parisian sentiment and that French opinion, which we call so lawless, has been sterner on this great theme of commercial honour than even Puritan New England, and than an American republic which prides itself on its good judgment and on its honesty. This lax use of our power to pass a bankruptcy law is just as indicative of low commercial honour in this nation as the sternness of the bankruptcy law of France is indicative of the high commercial honour in that nation. I am comparing the French with ourselves in commercial honour. No doubt we can fold our arms and stand in a haughty attitude when we contrast some of the other traits of American civilization with some of those of the Parisian; but in regard to this central matter I think our sister republic on the Seine has much to teach America yet.

While legislation is lax concerning commercial crimes, what can the Church do? Defaulters among church-members, swindles organized by men who have stood high in God's house, unscrupulous sharpness among those who have been prominent in the endeavour to bring men into a new life! On both sides of the Atlantic these spots are visible in the enswathement of the sun behind the sun. What are we to say when infidels point out these spots? It is not enough to reply that the spots are all the more conspicuous because they are on the sun, although that is the truth. *The brightness of the sunbeam of professed Christianity makes visible the myriad motes that float in it. These are unseen in common unilluminated air.* Nor is it enough to say that the exposure of crime is growing more frequent, and that crime is not doing so, although this perhaps is true. Shall we reply that legislation is lax? But why is legislation lax? Is it out of the power of the Church to create a proper sentiment on the topic of commercial honour? A better reply is the frank confession that great cities have corrupted commercial sentiment, injured the tone of public discussion, and that, under the voluntary system in the churches in the United States, Judas does not always go and hang himself, even when he carries the bag. In cities, in fashionable congregations, under the voluntary system, there is great difficulty in purging the American Church of commercial dishonour; and the difficulty may as well be recognized, without evasion. I suppose that the angel in Bunyan's vision, who saw the miser using a muck-rake, did not look forward to America. He might have seen that a muck-rake on the front steps of a church, used to draw in funds, is a very excellent piece of furniture—for what? For a church? Why, no! But for a Sunday club it is a very indispensable piece of furniture! This extravagance of ours in Sunday club palaces; this feeling of ours that social prestige is more to be regarded in certain churches than right standing before Almighty God; this using our Sunday clubs as social preserves to keep families in good position, and to dissuade them sweetly from intermarrying wrongly and below their standard in society; this tendency of cities to give to the Church itself commercial measuring tapes; the fact that a fifth of our population in the United States live in cities, and that the churches that set the fashions for the land are more often in cities than elsewhere—all these are circumstances pointing to peril in time to come and already big with disaster. I am not here to make apologies for church-members. Nor am I here to make apologies for Christianity. But I make a distinction

between Sunday clubs and churches, and between church-members and Christians. What is the trouble with a few church-members who cheat? They are church-members, and not Christians. You must make a distinction between Christianity and the Church.

> "King Olaf from the doorway spoke:
> 'Choose ye between two things, my folk—
> To be baptized or given up to slaughter!'
> And, seeing their leader stark and dead,
> The people with a murmur said:
> 'O King, baptize us with holy water!'
> So all the Drontheim land became
> A Christian land in name and fame."
>
> —*Longfellow*, "*The Saga of King Olaf*."

A barbaric clan in the ancient days would change sides in battle, suffer baptism in a river, and immediately enter on the new side into the clash of sword and spear. Were these people relieved of their barbaric tendencies by the swift ablution in the river before the battle? This is the way in which Christianity is distinguished from the Church. This is the way in which, when it is the fashion to belong to a church in our great cities, we now and then find fragmentary platoons of society brought into religious organizations and baptized outwardly, but not greatly changed spiritually. Thus it happens that, with one in six of the population in churches in this country, there is a percentage of church-members who do not appear to have learned to their finger-tips that portion of the Decalogue which says "Thou shalt not steal."

The world, which applauds this sentiment, will not unite with the Church to keep such men from doing mischief as church-members, or aid in the expulsion of such members from the Church. This same world which applauds will not unite with the Church to keep such men from getting in. The world that sneers at the plant of the Church is the soil out of which the Church grows, and the sap in that plant is as good as the sap in the sods. The haughtiness of the world toward the Church is self-condemnation. If, on this Christian platform, I am to think aloud, I must say that I have little hope for either the world or the Church unless the Church within the Church expels (or keeps from ever getting in) men who have not learned the Decalogue.

All this, you say, is the mood of rash inexperience, which thinks everything can be done easily in church discipline. You think this speech proceeds from forgetfulness of obtaining evidence concerning frauds, defalcation, and dishonest dealings by church-members. I keep in mind all these circumstances, and know very well how a divided parish may come from any stern application of church discipline in a great city, and that there are many gentler measures than church discipline to be applied before that should be called into use. Incredible as the assertion may appear, however, it is true of cities that they are to be first pure and then peaceable, and not first peaceable and then pure. Suppose that the gentler measures should be without effect. Is there not power enough in the Christian pulpit and platform in cities to make the Church too hot a place for thieves?

Suppose the sentiment of the parlour be made right in the first place. There are many princes in commerce who are also princes in the Church. If we follow the hints these men give us at times, and the guidance of their experience in the conduct of great affairs, we shall pretty soon find that the Church can set fashions for the upper ranks among the leaders of business—that is, for the best men in it. In most of the great lines of industry business is a regiment. *Men must keep*

step with each other; and if the church can set the fashions for the upper twenty in every hundred of business men, these upper twenty will set the step of the regiment. If you think it a dismal enterprise to try to create a soul under the ribs of death of some hypocrite, who ought to be in jail, why can you not attempt the setting of a fashion in the upper ranks of men of business? It is within the power of the church so to foster good fashions in the upper quarters of the ranks of commerce, and among the conservative classes, as to be the guardian of the commercial honour of the world.

What if you should teach the young that a man is no taller for standing on a bag of dollars, if the bag does not stand on the white marble pedestal of integrity, but lies in the gutter of unscrupulous sharpness, sinking in the ooze? What if you should strike with the whole force of Church discussion at the roots of American reverence for successful sharpness, even if it be dishonest? What if you should try to undermine this absurd measuring of the worth of men by what they are worth? There are circles of society in which it appears incredible that Agassiz could have once said publicly at Cambridge: "I am offered 500 dollars a night to lecture; but I decline all invitations, for I have no time to make money." It is before this kind of sentiment that America, as far as she is a Church, ought to bow down; but it is before the antipodes of this sentiment that our young men are sometimes bowing down, even after they pretend to possess education.

Our cities are filled with a commercial sentiment which makes much of the candlestick and little of the candle. When the candlestick is the chief object of attention, it may swallow and extinguish the candle itself. There is no nation in history that has thought more of the candlestick than of the candle that can now be seen from afar. Agassiz told San Francisco once that she might become as rich as Tyre and Sidon; but that unless she built up her churches and her schools and her literature she would be forgotten as soon.

Commerce is now international. A tempest of disaster in the trade of a single nation was once like a commotion in some land-locked lake. The storm in one lake did not extend to the others. The world was like a series of compartments in the side of an ocean-going steamer. Break in one compartment; you have not wrecked the vessel. But now commerce has taken down the partitions between these compartments. A storm on the commercial ocean rising on the Bosphorus may raise dangerous tides in New York; or, rising in the United States, may cover with its surges the coast of France and Belgium and England. The interdependence of nations is such that the failure of one great house brings danger upon a zone of different houses. *The Church has opportunity to clasp all the zones, through the inter-dependence of nations in commerce.* If she is true to her duty and secures commercial honour, she may make the commercial unity of the world the means of bringing about its religious unity. Nothing will enable the Church to draw the whole world into her bosom so closely as changing the secular pursuits of men into divine avocations. Let the secular arm of civilization encircle the world in one direction, and an opportunity would be open for the sacred arm, if the latter is only bold enough to assert its rights, to encircle the globe in the other.

The Lecture.

Would that the Greek Æsop were here to present before the bewildered public gaze some incisively vivid object lesson symbolizing the results likely to flow from socialistic political power in possession

of vast governmental patronage! I never think of what might happen, should Socialists have their way in the nationalization of the land, without being reminded of a scene, which perhaps would amuse Æsop, in the experience of certain Mexican quarry-men at Acapulco, when they first used a cart to carry heavy burdens. The vehicle was brought to the quarry, drawn by a mule as wise as any Æsop ever mentioned in his fables. The workmen, not knowing quite how to manage the business, expected to move easily whatever they should put between the wheels, no matter on which side of the axle the burden fell. So the mule, with musings much like those of Socialism of our day, was, no doubt, thinking of the ease with which he would make the wheels roll under gigantic masses from the quarry. But the workmen piled in block after block on the wrong side of the axle; and at last the shafts were lifted aloft, and the mule hung there, his long ears whisking in the breeze from the Pacific, and his four extremities diligently pawing the empty air, but utterly unable to obtain a hold on the land. That had been nationalized! When a long-eared people, drawing the socialistic political vehicle called the nationalization of the land, come near the quarries of the future and propose to draw the Millennium out of the mountain-side, and block after block is piled in, the result is likely to give rise to reflections! Political money is the first block it is proposed to place between the wheels. We saw lately a portion of the weight of that single stone from the quarry made to rest on this vehicle, and the mule became very light-footed when balanced against that weight alone. He was elated and inflated. But Socialism proposes to pile in not only political money; but political land, political railways, political canals, political factories, political mines, and so to increase indefinitely governmental patronage. Long before you have placed all these gigantic masses in this vehicle on the wrong side of the axle, your poor people who have expected to draw the socialistic conveyance will take precisely the posture of this Æsop's mule. Their long ears will be whisking in a wind from both seas, and their four hoofs will be powerless, because landless. Patronage, corruption, jobbery—these are the weights that in a socialistic state will lift power away from the people and give the Government a tendency to tyranny, such as the Commune exercised so mercilessly. The roughs in the municipal council of Paris had their own way for a time. Pretending to be the servants, they were the masters of the people. The population they governed was lifted aloft as a mule between the shafts, and one would think that the single historical example of roughs putting the weight upon the wrong side of the axle and lifting a city into this attitude, for the

laughter of gods and men, would be enough to convince the world of the impolicy of socialistic political arrangements. It has been enough to convince France. I advise you to keep Æsop's object lesson in view. It is because I believe that political money, political railways, political mines, and political land, would create so vast a patronage as to make the Government outweigh the people and lift the latter into the air, that I am against piling those weights on the wrong side of the axle. I am for the cause of the poor; and precisely because I am for it I am against socialistic arrangements, under which there would be need of a Cæsar, as a remedy for anarchy.

The best proof that socialistic schemes are a political blunder is a clear description of them. In a list of propositions, stated in serial order, close enough to show their logical inter-dependence, let me give you another picture of Æsop's mule between the shafts.

1. There are proposed by Socialists five methods of securing the nationalization of the lands, railroads, canals, machinery, and other means of the production of wealth:

(1) Confiscation by the state.

(2) The abolition of the right of inheritance and the reversion of private property to the state on the death of its present owners.

(3) Enforced sale, with payment only for the improvements effected on the land by its present possessors, and with no payment for the land itself.

(4) Enforced sale at market prices.

(5) Purchase by general consent.

These were the schemes of the International Society; and, although I cannot father all of them upon any one socialistic newspaper in the United States, the spirit of them can be found in every socialistic newspaper I ever saw. "Pay for the land a fair market price," I read over and over in some socialistic newspaper published in English; but when I take up the German and French sheets that come to us from Cincinnati and St. Louis, I find sterner propositions. Socialism is not agreed in this country how to obtain possession of the land. It wishes to nationalize the land by all or one or a few of these five measures. In a fair discussion of the whole field of the modern attack on property, we must mention not only the loud syllables, but the secret whispers of men in socialistic clubs. When I was in Chicago and St. Louis last, the citizens were told every morning by the daily press that socialistic clubs were buying arms and drilling in secret apartments. On making an effort to ascertain the sentiment of these clubs, I found that usually their scheme was not only to

outvote, but to outfight their opponents. Shot-gun Socialists are most of them Germans, Frenchmen, Poles, and Bohemians.

The demand for the confiscation of private property, so far as the abolition of the right of inheritance would accomplish such a result, is not unpopular even with Herbert Spencer. You remember that Spencer says "equity does not permit property in land." His reasoning is that, "if *one* portion of the earth's surface may justly become the possession of an individual, and may be held by him for his sole use and benefit, as a thing to which he has an exclusive right, then *other* portions of the earth may be so held, and eventually the *whole* of the earth's surface may be so held; and our planet may thus lapse altogether into private hands." * "It may be true," says this philosopher, "that you are entitled to compensation for the improvements land has received at your hands, and at the same time it may be equally true that no act, form, proceeding, or ceremony can make land your private property." †

That is Herbert Spencer in 1850. Well, why did he not go on to reason as some Socialists would? If the laws of marriage give a husband absolute protection in his rights as to his family, if one is to be united to one, and if there may be, as it were, absolute possession of wife by husband or of husband by wife, why may one not have absolute property in two, and three, and twenty, and the whole human race? There are Socialists who have applied Spencer's doctrine in that way, and have not distorted it. Of course, I do not accuse Spencer of such dreams; but I think the first of these pieces of reasoning is as much a dream as the second. The methods of land tenure are decided by convenience, and custom, and the consent of nations and large general justice. Spencer says the land was originally captured from Nature by barons and rough marauders, and that they had no right to it without obtaining the consent of society. As to the land, an individual, he thinks, can have only the right of a tenant renting from society; and by society, if you will follow Spencer's discussion, you will find that he means the entire population of the world. In holding certain acres as her own, how is New England to know whether she has the consent of Timbuctoo? These savages in the islands yonder have a certain right to our soil; they are a part of society. Spencer says there are only a few men who do care for a clean-cut universal principle; and he prides himself on being one of the few. He has a right to that distinction.

2. In 1870 there were in the United States 2,659,985 farms,

* "Social Statistics," chap. ix. section 2.

† *Ibid*, section 4.

averaging 153 acres each. These were in the possession of nearly 3,000,000 land-owners.

3. It is evident that the nationalization of all means of production in the United States, if attempted by force, would lead to one of the most fierce of civil wars.

4. If nationalization of the land were attempted by denial of the right of inheritance, this would be equivalent to confiscation, the exact pecuniary amount of which can be estimated by the difference in value between life interest in any particular estate and its fee simple.

5. If the socialistic revolution were attempted by the third of the five methods, the amount of property confiscated would be measured by the difference in value of the rights of a possessor of the soil and those of a mere tenant.

6. Lands held by corporations, including those of schools, colleges, and philanthropic institutions, would be confiscated by the socialistic scheme of the denial of the right of inheritance.

7. It is evident that the revolution attempted by Socialists, if conducted on the second or third of the methods it proposes to use, would lead to war.

8. Until Socialists can not only outvote, but also outfight the opponents of spoliation by confiscation of property, their first three measures cannot succeed, and perhaps no serious attempt will be made to carry them out.

I believe that there was a time when, if the International had obtained power in Europe, it would have attempted the nationalization of the land by confiscation, or, at least, by the denial of the right of inheritance. In the United States, with no large standing army, and under universal suffrage, a poorly-educated majority, not understanding how the rights of the poor would be swallowed in the whirlpool of fire, if socialistic revolution were fanned into a flame, might attempt the nationalization of all the means of production and adopt measures which would lead to civil war. Think of what demagogues might do to fan passion, and how great cities, with a population of tramps in some of their slums, might turn themselves into an army. If an hereditary ignorant and indigent and unemployed class is allowed to be brought into existence in the United States, the time may come when demagogues will be so influenced by the opportunities that universal suffrage will give for the elevation of socialistic opinions to power, that it will not do for capital to rely on Gatling guns. The chief defence for property in the United States is not to be found in artillery so much as in the churches and the schools. If America is leaning her arm on her cannon; if she

is thinking, while resting her elbow on her columbiads and Gatling guns, that she can neglect the school, and can pare down the salary of the teacher, and leave the slums to fester, and crowd tenement-houses with men and women as sardine-boxes are with fish, and allow the just demands of labour to go unanswered, and yet ultimately have sufficient protection from her military power, the time will come when America will be roughly awakened from this dream. I do not say the Gatling guns will easily be turned against honest property; but that was what was done in Paris. We saw that municipality brought under such control of the mob that weeks of the sternest military contest the world has ever witnessed were needed to effect the reduction of one city. But by-and-by we are to have a half-dozen cities as large as Paris. You say that this is not a topic for to-day or to-morrow, but for the day after to-morrow, and that we shall not have these cities soon. But they are coming, and to-day is the time to discuss the question whether some Thiers or McMahon shall be needed before every great city at our second centennial to keep order when demagogues fan the Gehenna flames of socialistic revolution. Schools and churches, and not Gatling guns, are to be the delivery of America from socialistic abuse of universal suffrage.

Nevertheless, I do not underrate the military power of a nation that has crushed one rebellion, and will be well educated enough to make short work of another, if a second is attempted. Outfight the farmers of the land! As Professor Hitchcock has said: "Other shots may yet be heard round the world besides those fired by Massachusetts farmers at Concord Bridge. I will risk our farmers. No French engineering could barricade a prairie, no German bullets shoot off a nation's head."* There has never yet been seen in American history a day so red with blood as will be that day when Socialism attempts spoliation here by force of arms.

9. It is evident that the diffusion of property among the voting class is the most effective remedy against schemes of spoliation and confiscation; but this diffusion is already greater in the United States than in any other nation of equal size and wealth.

10. If the nationalization of the land and other means of the production of wealth were to be effected by purchase, at the market price, by general consent, it would cost more than the national revenue. At least an equal amount would need to be paid for railways, mines, buildings, machinery, and other appliances as for the land.

11. The money thus required would need to be raised by a state loan.

* "Socialism," p. 42.

12. It has been shown mathematically that the interest at 4½ per cent. on the sum thus required would in Great Britain exceed nearly three times the present national revenue of the United Kingdom,* and a similar proposition may be shown to be true of the United States.

It is too much for sober discussion to hope to arrest the attention of the dreamers who believe that they can pay the market value of the land of the United States, and so nationalize it. As Webster said concerning the nullification laws, if the thing can be done, honest men can tell how it can be done. The most overwhelming reply Webster made to Hayne was a straightforward statement of the way in which nullification would have to be carried out :

"All the while
Sonorous metal breathing martial sounds."

In the United States and territories there are 3,600,000 square miles, or more that 2,300 millions of acres of land. Keep in mind at what prices building land is sold in our numerous cities, and the worth of our vast regions of the fattest agricultural land the world contains. Nobody thinks the market value of the lands of the United States is less, on the average, than a dollar an acre. *How do you propose to raise* 2,300 *millions of dollars to purchase it?* This sum is so large that the interest on it, at the lowest rates at which money is borrowed, would be greater than the present national revenue.

Nobody thinks that the lands of the United States are not worth twice those of Great Britain. Competent authorities say that the value of all the land and houses in our mother island, exclusive of mines and railways, cannot be less than 4,500 millions of pounds. The annual interest on that sum, at four and a half per cent., would be more than 200 millions of pounds, or nearly three times the British national revenue.† How do Socialists in Great Britain propose to obtain this sum? How do Socialists in America propose to raise a sum twice as large?

13. Even if the rent of land and machinery were maintained after the revolution at its present high level, there would be an annual deficit of colossal size in the income of the socialistic state, as compared with that of its predecessor.

14. But one object of the proposed revolution is to reduce rents and make land cheap, so that the impoverishment of the state would assume yet more enormous proportions after the nationalization of the instruments of production had been once effected.

15. The Socialists propose to raise funds by a graduated tax on

* See Fawcett, "Political Economy," pp. 280-300.
† *Ibid*, p. 283.

property, and at the same time to make the state the possessor of all the real property in the country.

Professor Fawcett well says that this is making a man rich by taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another. It is like an attempt to lift yourself over a wall by standing in a basket and pulling at its ears.

16. Under the graded income-tax proposed by Socialists large fortunes would be financially undesirable, and so the state would be yet further impoverished.

17. The increase of population would necessitate a new subdivision of the land, for at the end of fifty years after the first division the population would be doubled.

18. Some portion of the land or machinery rented at first would be taken away from those who had used them; and provision would thus be made for the increased population.

19. Under the proposed income-tax, the improvident would thus be provided for at the expense of the provident, a fine would be placed on prudence, and one of the most effective checks to the undue increase of the population would be removed.

20. Encouragement would be given to reckless increase of population and to every species of improvidence.

John Stuart Mill is right when he says society might, perhaps, be justly called on to provide for all who are now on the globe; but not for all that they may choose to bring into the world. The encouragement that would be given to recklessness and every kind of imprudence by socialistic arrangements are topics which Socialists very rarely discuss. Socialistic schemes wreck themselves on the increase of population. That is a subject very infrequently taken up by socialistic writers; but it is the colossal rock on which their ship splinters itself.

21. The abolition of private ownership would destroy the magic of property in producing industry, and so yet further impoverish the state.

Michelet tells us of a French peasant of a Sunday walking out in his clean linen and unsoiled blouse. His wife is at church, and this simple farmer paces across his acres and looks fondly at his land. You see him in solitude; but his face is illumined when he thinks his farm is his own, from the surface of the globe to its centre, and that the climate is his own, from the surface of the earth up to the seventh heaven. You find that man, says Michelet, if a stranger approaches him, withdrawing, that he may enjoy his affections in solitude; and, as he turns away from his Sunday walk through his own pastures, you notice that he looks back over his shoulder with affec-

tion and parts with regret. He is not at work; he is not out to keep off interlopers. He is out simply to enjoy the feeling of ownership and to look upon himself as one member of responsible society.* "The magic of property," says Arthur Young, "turns sand into gold," and this phrase has become a standard one in political economy. That magic of property, which has done more in this country to produce a spirit of self-help than state aid for the whole planet ever could do to produce a similar spirit—that magic of property, the very heart of republican institutions, would be split open by the socialistic dagger and its blood let out.

22. The distribution of the purchased lands among the people would either be at a uniform price, and thus involve further bankruptcy; or it would be by renting lands according to their worth, as determined by what is offered to pay for their rent, and thus competition would not be got rid of by the nationalisation of the instruments of production.

23. The socialistic state would have political money, political land, political industrial machinery, and the management of all these would be subject to the fluctuation of politics.

24. The fluctuations in a political currency alone would be enough to destroy confidence in business enterprise; but political land added to political money would ruin the state.

25. Governments acquire power through patronage; but the state which places at the disposal of its government, its money, land, and all the means of production, opens the way for endless pecuniary and political corruption. Such a government would have more opportunities of rewarding friends and punishing opponents than were ever possessed by kings or aristocracies, and thus its temptations would be greater than any government known to history has ever withstood.

26. The whole socialistic nation would be exposed to demoralisation from the tendency of the immense governmental patronage to produce jobbery, intrigue, and favouritism.

Then would come what? Why, when once Æsop's long-eared animal is in the air, some driver seizes the reins, adjusts the heavy weight to the right side of the axle, and thereafter holds at his mercy the vehicle and the brute that draws it. Cæsar was Rome's escape from Communism, † and the day that a socialistic revolution shall succeed in the United States you will find on our map a Rubicon and a man on horseback ready to cross it.

---

* "*Le Peuple*," 1 *re partie*, ch. i.

† See Professor Hitchcock's "Socialism," p. 43.

SELF-HELP, NOT STATE-HELP, THE HOPE OF THE POOR.

Prelude—Fragmentary College Culture.

Scipio once had a dream concerning the structure of the external universe and its harmonies. After reading Cicero's report of that vision, it was my fortune, on a certain midnight, as a day of prayer for colleges drew nigh, to pass through the gate of dreams, and to have a vision of the inner universe and its harmonies—that is, of the laws of culture, the necessary conditions of its completeness, and the mischief of its fragmentariness. In my dream I thought I was in my study on Beacon Hill, looking out on land and sea, and that it occurred to me to arrange my books according to their topics. The resolution seized me to try the effect of placing my volumes on as many different shelves as there ought to be different branches in a course of liberal education.

So I began with mathematics on the floor, and placed there the Greek Euclid, to lead the list of my favourite books on geometry and algebra and trigonometry, and surveying, the differential and integral calculus, quaternions and analytical mechanics. The self-evident truths contained in the axioms of Euclid I affectionately remembered as the first rock of adamant on which I had placed my foot in my search after certainty. All the way up through the superstructure of culture my shelves of books were likely, as I saw, to depend on these axioms; and so I placed them at the base of the collection, as foundation stories of the temple I was to build. The next shelf, naturally enough, contained works on logic; and here stood volumes by Aristotle and Sir William Hamilton and Whately and John Stuart Mill. Here was a luminous and exact science depending on Euclid's axioms. On a shelf for rhetoric stood the treatises of Aristotle and Quintillian, and Cicero and Fenelon and Whately and Blair, besides the orations of Demosthenes, Chatham, Burke, Webster, and Phillips, with Macaulay and Carlyle and Bossuet and Massillon and South and Jeremy Taylor.

Next came a shelf devoted to the languages; and, although the list of books began on the left with grammars and lexicons of Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Sanscrit, French, and German, it contained on the right the great classics in each of these tongues. Here were Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides; here were Corneille, Molière, and Racine; here were Goethe, Schiller, and Richter; here were also Isaiah and the Prophets and the Psalms.

Political economy occupied the fifth shelf; and here stood Adam Smith and Ricardo, Malthus and John Stuart Mill, Cairnes and Fawcett, and Price and Rogers, together with DeTocqueville and Roscher and Schafle, and the Americans, Carey and Bowen and Walker. Great speeches were here too from Cobden and Bright and Gladstone, with works on statistics and politics and the most modern philanthropies and industries.

History stood on the next shelf; and here were Homer and Thucydides, Gibbon and Grote and Hallam, Macaulay and Prescott and Motley and Bancroft, and in the rear of these volumes lay a mass of the original historical documents from which the books are drawn.

Physics came next, with works on astronomy, optics, acoustics, electricity,

magnetism, and the spectroscope. Chemistry occupied the next shelf, with volumes on crystallography and mineralogy and a score of industrial arts, together with discussions concerning that famous firm of Carbon, Oxygen & Co., which was supposed to be able to produce life itself; but which Virchow says has become bankrupt of late. Natural history drew to itself the fascinating volumes on anatomy, physiology, botany, zoölogy, and geology.

The fine arts were represented on the next shelf by Kugler and Lübke and Winckelmann and Ruskin and Crowe and Cavalcascelle, and by the best discussions of Greek, Roman, mediæval, and modern art.

Next came music, with the books on harmony and counterpoint, and the masterpieces of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven.

Gymnastics occupied the next shelf, with works on the laws of health.

Metaphysics filled a shelf with Aristotle and Leibnitz and Kant and Sir William Hamilton, and Edwards and Lotze and Ulrici.

Ethics drew to its shelf Kant also, and Butler and Price and Stewart, and Dorner and Lotze and Hartmann.

Finally, at the summit of the temple stood the Christian Evidences; and here were Butler and Paley and Whately and Rawlinson and Julius, Müller and Dorner and Liddon and Fisher, besides the historians of the religious life in nations and in individuals.

Volumes belonging to distinctively professional studies were not placed in this symbolical collection. They stood on an opposite wall. When all the books representing a full college culture were arranged, I counted them from below upward on fifteen shelves, with these names:

15. The Christian Evidences.
14. Ethics.
13. Metaphysics.
12. Gymnastics.
11. Music.
10. The Fine Arts.
9. Natural History.
8. Chemistry.
7. Physics.
6. History.
5. Political Economy.
4. Languages.
3. Rhetoric.
2. Logic.
1. Mathematics.

These, in my dream, appeared to me to be the necessary parts of any education that deserves to be called liberal. The dreams of a young man about fulness of culture are very different when he is in college and when he has been ten years out of it, face to face with the enemy. I now think that no temptation of mine in the university began to be as mischievous as an inclination to omit certain branches, to make electives of favourites, and so to leave colossal gaps in my culture. Looking back, I see that even such unimportant work as I have been endeavouring to do cannot afford those gaps; and if in my little business this is the case, what must not be the necessity of a full culture in the great professions, and in literature, in science, and other regions where men must be equipped, North, South, East, and West?

I tried, in my dream, I remember, to leave certain of these shelves vacant; and the effect was startling. When I left out mathematics as the basis of this line of shelves, the whole wall appeared to topple; and I saw on the floor, in my vision, certain imps of confusion dancing where the books on the exact sciences ought to have been. I tried to leave the shelf of logic empty, and the imps appeared upon it and made it a dancing-board. Languages and rhetoric—these shelves go together. I found I could not empty the one without partially emptying the other. When I tried to leave the shelves empty, I found the imps appearing to make dancing-boards of the vacant spaces. But further up the imps grew larger. I saw that these lower shelves, important as they are, when left vacant, did not bring into vision quite as mischievous-looking fiends as some of the higher did when they were empty. When I left out political economy, the shelf was swiftly made a dancing-board for the demons that support Socialism, Communism, and the whole swarm of political heresies.

You say that I have put into the list of necessary college studies some topics not usually insisted on—for instance, the fine arts Well, when I tried to leave that shelf vacant, Plato's ghost appeared above the library, and reproached me in the name of what he had taught us in his "Republic"; reproached me in the name of what Goethe used to say to us about his people being proficient in the art of ugliness; reproached me in the name of all travel, which must know something of architecture and painting, if it is to have open eyes; reproached me in the name of the needs of the common people. You say music ought not to be considered a necessary part of a liberal training; but Plato told me better. I read in his "Republic," as he held it out to me in his ghostly hand, the old famous saying that the soul is musical in its structure, and that gymnastics, as well as music, should receive careful attention in childhood and through life.

"Musical training is a more potent instrument than any other because rhythm and harmony find their way into the secret places of the soul, on which they might fasten, imparting grace and making the soul graceful of him who is rightly educated, or ungraceful of him who is ill-educated. And also because he who has received this true education of the inner being will most shrewdly perceive omissions or faults in art or Nature, and, with a true taste, while he praises and rejoices over and receives into his soul the good, and becomes noble and good, he will justly blame and hate the bad, now in the days of his youth, even before he is able to know the reason why; and when Reason comes, he will recognize and salute her as a friend with whom his education has made him long familiar."—*Plato*, "*Republic*," *Book II.*

Not to dwell on the effects that I saw, in my dream, resulting from leaving the lower shelves empty, let me describe at least a part of the vision occurring when philosophy and ethics were left vacant shelves. The imps here were more than imps; they were demons. Some of them hissed at all clear conviction of any kind; some of them, not understanding what axiomatic truths are, assumed that there are none. I found that on these vacant shelves those demons were dancing that foster the growth of false philosophical systems and erratic opinion in every form. A lack of knowledge of first principles—empty shelves in metaphysics and ethics—I found to be the real source of the agnosticism and scepticism and doctrinal indifference of many in our day, some of whom are in the front rank of literature and science.

"The gods laugh in their sleeve,
To watch man doubt and fear,
Who knows not what to believe,
Since he sees nothing clear,
And dares stamp nothing false where he finds nothing sure."
—*Matthew Arnold*, "*Empedocles on Etna.*"

These upper shelves left vacant, I found myself looking through the wall into a murky chaos. The topmost shelf of all vacant, I found the whole set of shelves brooded over by smoke from the chaos, and that hardly any of the lower shelves were serviceable. Metaphysics, ethics, the Christian evidences, the top shelves—leave those vacant in our college courses, and the result will be that we shall have plenty of men well trained in all particulars except in regard to the highest themes and as ignorant on those topics as the most of us are concerning recondite branches of chemistry and mathematics.

It is one of the subtle mischiefs of our modern college courses of study that they crowd up those books which ought to stand on these upper three shelves into the professional schools. I open the list given us of prescribed elective studies in colleges, and, although electives are very numerous in metaphysics and somewhat abundant in ethics, I find that in more than one respectable American college a man may receive his degree without knowing anything of importance as to these subjects. This is true not only of several state universities managed by politicians in the West. For one, I am forced, in the name of mere culture, to prefer those colleges that do insist on giving their students in prescribed and not merely elective courses something more than an outline of these higher branches, and are not leaving the imps to make dancing-boards of these upper shelves in the list of fifteen.

Every gap in native endowments is an inlet to eccentricity in a man's spirit; and every gap in his culture is an inlet of unsound conviction. Why should we train men in the outlines of political economy, and not train them in the outlines of metaphysics and ethics? Why should we teach men so sedulously the outlines of chemistry and botany, and say nothing to them on the fundamental problems of conscience? The Christian Evidences are taught in most of our institutions, but in a vague, hurried way; and the tendency is to push out the two or three volumes that stand on these upper shelves into professional schools. What is the result? A college education ceases to be a liberal education. The man who enters the law is too busy to take up the study of that upper shelf; the man who enters the medical profession is usually too busy; and he who enters politics may soon cease to care for these books at all. His culture is no more complete than the human form is without shoulders and head. There is a hierarchy of sciences leading up naturally to the highest themes of philosophy and ethics; and I undertake to say that the colleges that are careless to the degree of cutting off of these upper three shelves are headless trunks. They are torsos that never will have life to carry civilization through the future with safety.

My dream ended by my filling all these shelves; and when each of the supports for books on the fifteen themes was crowded, and when I had imagined—what I could only imagine—the better part of this information and discipline to be transferred to my own soul, I saw that the chaos dissipated itself in the background. The imps disappeared one by one. In the clear azure, where the chaos had ruled, there began to appear forms of light; and behind them an Infinite unnamable Figure watched over civilization, the axis of the globe standing with its soft spindle on one outstretched pointing finger, and both palms pierced.

There are thousands who cannot pass through our universities; but who would gladly have libraries containing shelves enough to represent a complete college training. You may not read twenty books on each shelf; but why can you not read fifteen books, one on each shelf? It was the glory of Boston to found, a few years ago, a reading society for women; and it had at one time hundreds of members in different parts of the United States. There were lists of books recommended by a central committee, and abstracts of the volumes read were sent

to the committee in Boston for examination. In that way inspiritment was given to home training, succeeding school life. In a republic there are very few improvements more important than this pushing out of culture into the home life of the masses. It is no descent from the high theme of university training to speak of reading organizations among the people. Here is a letter from William Cullen Bryant, written just before he was caught up into the Unseen Holy, and indorsing a scheme for the promotion of study among the common people and for giving the college student's outlook to the average citizen :

"New York, May 18th, 1878.

"*My Dear Sir*,—I cannot be present at the meeting called to organize the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle; but I am glad that such a movement is on foot and wish it the fullest success. There is an attempt to make science, or a knowledge of the laws of the material universe, an ally to the school which denies a separate spiritual existence and a future life—in short, to borrow of science weapons to be used against Christianity. The friends of religion, therefore, confident that one truth never contradicts another, are doing wisely when they seek to accustom the people at large to think and to weigh evidence, as well as to believe. By giving a portion of their time to a vigorous training of the intellect and the study of the best books, men gain the power to deal satisfactorily with questions with which the mind might otherwise become bewildered. It is true that there is no branch of human knowledge so important as that which teaches the duties we owe to God and to each other ; and that there is no law of the universe—sublime and wonderful as it may be—so worthy of being fully known as the law of love, which makes him who obeys it a blessing to his species, and the universal observance of which would put an end to a large proportion of the evils which affect mankind. Yet is a knowledge of the results of science and such of its processes as lie most open to the popular mind important for the purpose of showing the different spheres occupied by science and religion, and preventing the inquirer from mistaking their divergence from each other for opposition.

"I perceive this important advantage in the proposed organization—namely, that those who engage in it will mutually encourage each other. It will give the members a common pursuit, which always begets a feeling of brotherhood; they will have a common topic of conversation and discussion, and the consequence will be that many who, if they stood alone, might grow weary of the studies which are recommended to them, will be incited to perseverance by the interest which they see others taking in them. It may happen, in rare instances, that a person of eminent mental endowments, which otherwise might have remained uncultivated and unknown, will be stimulated in this manner to diligence and put forth unexpected powers, and, passing rapidly beyond the rest, become greatly distinguished and take a place among the luminaries of the age.

"I shall be interested to watch, during the little space of life which may yet remain to me, the progress and results of the plan which has drawn from me this letter.

"I am, sir, very truly yours,

"W. C. Bryant.

"Rev. John H. Vincent, Plainfield, N. J."

There is in Western New York a lake called Chautauqua, the highest water in the state ; and thousands of people are accustomed to gather there in the summer in exercises which Dr. John Lord, who lectured there last August, told me resemble the old Pythian and Isthmian Games of Greece. Certain it is that fifty or sixty lectures are delivered each season there by men some of whom are known to the nation ; and written examinations are passed through by hundreds who come there and report their progress in reading during the year. This popular movement is both an achievement and a promise, and is worthy of imitation from sea to sea. I hold in my hand official information that a course of study

embracing four years' reading has been laid out, that text-books have been prepared, and that 3,000 persons have paid a tuition fee in order to have the benefit of the guidance of this course of reading and of the suggestions that come from the learned men at the head of its different departments. Some of these teachers are professors in our colleges. The object of this effort, which Bryant commended with his last breath, is to give the serious citizen the college student's outlook. It requires an average of four to six hours devoted every week to remunerative reading. It embraces studies in Greek history and literature, Biblical history and literature, English history and literature, astronomy, and physiology. It aims to bring the college-boy and his father, when the latter has not been through college, a little nearer to each other. The plain man often has great strength of mind, but lacks outlook. This movement takes him to the summit of a hill and shows him a wide world of thought. It gives to the domestic woman something to think about when she works. It puts windows and skylights into dull houses. It incites old and young to new lines of reading. It tones up the home-circle and will send more boys and girls to college. It will put more good books on the little shelves. It will put more good engravings on dull walls. It will convince plain people that the real Church is not afraid of Science.

The education of woman in separate institutions is making immense advances. College examinations for women are changing public sentiment as to the education proper for the sex. I beg young men in colleges, if they are satisfied with a fragmentary culture, to beware of non-academic competition.

The Lecture.

Let us imagine ourselves on Selkirk's Island, watching that hermit, while with no tool but some tooth of a shark he hollows a tree into a boat. In a remote part of the island the man Friday, not yet discovered by Selkirk, lies asleep. Weeks pass. Selkirk is industrious, and at last he is in possession of a little vessel, by which he can pass from island to island. He forms the acquaintance of the savage, and the latter claims that the boat is his, as much as Selkirk's. We will suppose the savage to have been instructed in modern Socialism. He is asked to give a reason for the faith that is in him and he quotes the famous phrase of Lassalle: "To every man according to his needs." "I desire to go to yonder island in that boat, and, therefore, have a right to it. The tree, before you cut it down, belonged to society at large. You have no right of the prescriptive sort to the timber from which the boat is made." To this Selkirk would say, if he had been instructed in Locke's writings: "Although the tree may have been yours as much as mine while it was standing, I have so changed its value that it is mine now more than yours; for you have been asleep while I have been at work." "Well, but," the savage would say, "Proudhon taught that all property is robbery." Selkirk would reply, if he wished to place the right of property on a foundation that will bear all attack: "I have a right to this boat because I

have a right to the fruits of my own labour. I have a right to my cave here, and the slope of ground that I have cultivated before it, because I have mixed my labour with the rock and with the soil. It may be the mountain-side was yours as much as mine before I put my labour into it. The soil belonged to society at large; but, if I have a right to the fruits of my own labour, the additions I have made to the cave, the changes which are the result of the work I have put upon the land, are mine." Friday, if he were well instructed in Socialism, would say that there can be no property in land, and that the moment Selkirk is paid for the additional value the cave and land possess on account of the work expended on them they may be taken away from him; whereupon a debate of considerable interest would arise between Selkirk and Friday. If, in the course of the contest, it should turn out that Selkirk is the stronger man; if, in the struggle for existence, Selkirk should be successful, this man Friday would have to go further back than to Proudhon for instruction. He would have to go back to Selkirk's cradle. How is it that Selkirk came into the world with more power than Friday? The most interesting of all text-books that I know anything about is the cradle, into which the Supreme Powers drop men. The gods may be levellers; but they are levellers up, not levellers down. Undoubtedly they desire to lift Friday to the condition of Selkirk. If Friday is hired, he shall have fair wages; no injustice shall be done to him; he shall have instruction; and yet Selkirk has a better equipment of powers and has a right to use them. The truth is, the Supreme Powers bring men into the world with unequal endowments and with unequal tendencies to make use of their gifts, and so long as they continue to do this the cradle and what the Supreme Powers put into it will be answer enough to Socialism.

This simple example of Selkirk and Friday in the cradle I wish to use to illustrate the maze of our modern discussions concerning labour and capital. The relations of these two men are not a maze. The case is all clear when only two factors come into the problem. But the laws of mathematics are the same in those calculations of the eclipses that cover whole walls, and require, perhaps, the study of weeks for their comprehension by the ordinary mind—I say the laws of mathematics are the same in the most complex problem and in the four rules of arithmetic. We may trace in Selkirk and Friday in their cradle and on their island the course of one portion of the curve that sweeps through all the mazes of the discussion concerning capital and labour, the right to property and the right of bequest. In every arc a circle has the same law; and if we could follow it everywhere through the maze, it would be the same circle that we see in this one

are. If you will fasten your eyes on these object-lessons, I shall hope to carry your assent to these propositions, which affirm only what the object-lessons teach :—

1. The legitimacy of private property rests on the right inherent in every workman either to consume or to save the product of his labour. Producers have a right to what they have themselves produced.

If we can agree on this proposition, that when a man has earned something he may either consume it or save it, we shall come very nearly to agreement as to the right of private property. I do not say that it is absolutely self-evident that a man who has earned something has a right either to consume it or save it ; but I say that it is absolutely self-evident that you have not a right to steal it. If a man who has earned something has not a right to dispose of what he has earned, who has ? Social science is filled with truisms ; but the self-evident propositions, the truisms themselves, that lie at the basis of political economy, need to be emphasised in debate with popular fallacies on that theme. It is said, for instance, that a man has a right to the cloth he produces as an operative. He would have if he had produced it. The operative only gives form to costly materials which capital brought together. It is one of the common cries of Socialists that the operative classes should have the railways that they build and the cloth they weave. We do not deny the principle that the labourer has a right to what he produces when we assert that the product of our great industries must be divided between labour and capital. It is perfectly evident that the product is the result of a number of causes operating together, and that the labourer is far from being the sole cause of production. He does not produce the material. He does not bring the material to the place where its form is changed. He would find, in most cases, the moment all other forces than his own were abstracted from the multiplex industry, that nothing would be produced by himself.

2. To prevent a man from exchanging a part of what he has produced for its equivalent would be an infringement of his right of property.

Suppose that I have earned something, and it is not in quite the shape that I need for the support of life. Have I not the right to change it for something that will satisfy me better ? If you say I have not, I say you infringe my original inherent right to do what I will with my own, when I injure no one else.

3. The right of property, therefore, includes the right of exchange, bargain, and contract.

4. It is evident, also, that it includes the right of bequest, and that is the basis of the right of inheritance.

5. It includes also the provision that a title, after a certain period, should be given by prescription.

What if Selkirk here on his island had no right to a foothold when he first landed? He passes years in his solitude and makes the garden resemble Eden, and it is finally ascertained that the island belonged to some barbaric chief. Selkirk took possession without purchase; but the chief, after ascertaining what Selkirk has done, leaves him in possession, and Selkirk goes on improving the island. Many years pass, and he obtains at last what our laws call a prescriptive right to the soil. *He has mingled so much of his labour with it that more injustice would be done in turning him out than in allowing him to stay.* Although defending several extreme views on this right of property, John Stuart Mill himself undertakes to maintain that the right of property includes the right of possession by prescription. Far away is the cool, clear Mill from the wildness of Herbert Spencer, who claims that a clean-cut, universal principle must be run through all these cases of prescription, and the right to private property denied even when it has not been disturbed for centuries.*

6. Men are sent into the world with different endowments, and they make a very different use of their endowments.

7. So long as private property is allowed to exist there will therefore be great inequalities in the distribution of wealth.

8. Inequalities in the distribution of property arise, under free governments, not from inequalities of social condition, but from inequalities of personal condition.

9. It follows that until private property ceases to be a natural right, and until men are born with equal powers, there can be no escape from the action of the principle of competition, or that reward should be proportioned to exertion.

10. It is, therefore, evident that the legislation of the Supreme Powers themselves has established the rule that a man's success shall depend on self-help.

Go into Washington Street or Broadway, scoop up a hundred men, bring them here, and you find great inequality in what you call their social condition. Well, what do you mean by that? Why, some of them are paupers; one or two of them are millionaires; out of a hundred there are not more than fifty who are not in anxiety as to the method of obtaining their daily bread. Of the families repre-

* See Mill, "Principles of Political Economy," Vol. I., Book II., chap. 11, sec. 2. See also Roscher, "Political Economy," Vol. I, chap. 5.

sented by the hundred men, perhaps four or five are starving. You affirm that these inequalities in the social condition of the hundred you have taken up at random to represent American civilization are an offence to Heaven and ought to be an offence to human legislation. Well, I will not deny that the inequality is an offence to Heaven and ought to be an offence to human legislation; but the question is whether these are inequalities of social condition or of personal condition. The hundred men are all living under American law. How did they start in life? Why, that millionaire, it may be, started with twenty-five cents; that pauper started with as much. Every man of the hundred has, very possibly, had as good a chance under the law as the millionaire had when he began. You say capital gives advantage to its possessor. Many a rich man has started on his career with no capital but hands and brains, and has had no advantage from law that all may not have. It is possible, you say, that those two or three rich men have inherited property and saved it. And I reply that it is equally possible that some of these paupers inherited property and have spent it. Let us be candid, and not charge the public law with faults which belong to personal character.

We have no law of primogeniture. We have no aristocracy. I am not here to defend the arrangement that exists in England concerning land. I am not here to defend any mediæval idea. I am discussing American institutions. Each of these hundred men has been protected in his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The prejudice of class or caste darkened no cradle of the hundred. There was a free course for every one in youth. There was public education for every one of them. American civilization stood over the cradle of this pauper, rocked it; offered to his opening faculties Christian culture; gave him standing in the common school; if he could not pay for his education, paid it for him; warmed the room for him; bought him text-books, it may be. The guardian genius of our land did no more than this for the millionaire who started poor and has acquired wealth. Among the hundred there are great differences of natural power. One man was born to good health; another to poor health. One man was born with mental faculties, like gigantic scythes, that can sweep down harvests in abundance and gather them into his granaries; and another man was born with nothing but a sickle or a dull pruning-knife with which to forage for existence in this world. The Supreme Powers are responsible in part for the difference among men when they are put into the cradles. The laws of hereditary descent are under the management of men to a great degree; and we are responsible in part for the fact that men come into the world with nothing but

sickles and pruning-hooks with which to forage for themselves. But there is an inequality in the cradle. There is a personal factor in this problem; and, unless you go back, as Friday did, to the cradle, you have not begun to study your theme. But, even if the hundred men had been equally endowed in the cradle, would they have been likely to make the same use of their powers? How do men act? What do you find to be the facts of human history? Some men are industrious and economical, and some are not. And now I put it to Socialists; I put it to the sacred inmost conscience of every citizen here, whether the contrasts which exist among these one hundred men are not far more the result of inequalities of personal condition than of inequalities of social or political condition.

We are agreed, therefore, that we must take lessons from the cradle, and from those ancestral spaces out of which all men come and into which all men haste. We want a political economy that can be indorsed by the Supreme Powers. I care nothing for the politicians and for the theorists unless their schemes are in harmony with the majestic laws which are not to be repealed by any human vociferation. If we were to divide property equally among the hundred men, what would be the effect? Levelling will not last unless we level the Supreme Powers. I take my hundred men from Broadway, my hundred from Boston, and filch from the pockets of the rich, and fill those of the poor. I equalize wealth in all the pockets Monday morning; but where are the pockets Saturday night?

A voice: "Nobody wants to do it."

Socialism and Communism have said over and over at the mouth of Proudhon, at the mouth of Lassalle, and at the mouth of Karl Marx that property in land is robbery. Marx elaborately defended the deeds of the Parisian Commune. Over and over the ringleaders among Socialists have indicated their willingness, if they only had the power, to confiscate, in whole or in part, property in land and in all the means of production. I say, Come on with your schemes of confiscation, and forced loans, and graded income-taxes, and irredeemable political currency, under universal suffrage, and, if you are sufficiently frank in proclaiming the doctrines of your ringleaders, then, under military necessity, and even here in the United States, if we must get rid of universal suffrage, we shall! Rather than allow Socialistic confiscation of the value Selkirk has added to his cave and to the plot of ground before it, we will have one of the fiercest of civil wars; and, rather than give property Monday morning into the control of men who before Saturday night will have produced inequality again by their own spendthrift character, we will see to it that in

this country sterner regulations are made than now exist to repress heresies and demagogues under universal suffrage.

11. The community of goods in one portion of the Primitive Church was a community in use, and not in possession. It was not instituted as an example; it was not imitated outside of Jerusalem; it was voluntary and existed only among believers.

When I stand in the presence of scholars of the sacred profession and discuss this proposition, I speak with bated breath, for they are authorities on this special topic of exegetical research. There is a Biblical justice, a Biblical philanthropy, a Biblical unfathomable tenderness for the poor; but the same book teaches that, if a man provides not for his own, he is worse than an infidel, and that he who will not work shall not eat.

One of the most mischievous of the forces at work in certain vague parts of the mind of the community is the thought that, after all, there is a Biblical socialism or a Biblical community of goods. Property in land in the old Jewish days had many limitations. There was an occasional releasing of debtors. A Jew would not take interest from a Jew. And was there not, many ask, a community of goods, and were not all things in common in the Primitive Church at Jerusalem among those who believed? For one, I think that there is nothing quite so mischievous as to mistake a scoured pewter tankard for the sun in heaven. The scheme of thought by which Biblical authority is brought over to the side of Socialism is a pewter tankard; but when the eyes of certain erratics are fixed on it they think they see the sun, and the latter becomes visible to them only when we smite an opening directly through the pewter into the noon. The community of goods at Jerusalem was not compulsory. It did not come about by the use of universal suffrage or any sort of confiscation. "While it remained, was it not thine own?" were the words addressed to Ananias; "and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?" (Acts v. 4.) The community was one of use, and not of ownership. It was a voluntary act of love, rather than a duty. Still less was it a right which the majority might assert against individuals. It was a community among men of similar belief, and not between those who were for a commonwealth organized as a theocracy and those who were against it. It was a community among men who, in both fact and theory, were brethren. And then, as scholars have shown over and over, it was a community never imitated. Nowhere outside of Jerusalem do we find any such early Christian community of goods. Nowhere do we find it recommended by apostolic precept.* Some scholars have gone so far as to say that the community of

* See Mosheim, "*De Vera Natura Communionis Bonorum*, II. 1.

goods produced the chronic poverty which existed in the Church at Jerusalem.* Contributions were taken up for the Church and the poor at Jerusalem in all parts of the early Christian world.

12. Only by self-help can the mobility of labour be secured.

13. Only by self-help can the working-man withstand the competition of machinery.

14. Only by self-help can the working man avail himself of the benefits of building societies, trades-unions, and co-operation.

15. The best methods of poor relief have been found by experience to be those calculated to produce a spirit of self-help.

16. The test of good legislation as to labour is its tendency to produce in the labourer a spirit of self-help.

17. Only by self-help is competition made perfect.

18. Only by self-help are the economical harmonies of supply and demand brought into action.

Keep in mind the distinction between perfect and imperfect competition. The Manchester school in political economy asserts that the laws of supply and demand are such perfect economical harmonies that, if we let labour and capital alone, wages will rise as high as they can and manufacturers not fall into bankruptcy, and profits as high as they can and the working-men not be ground down into poverty and ignorance. The law of competition very rarely works freely in this world. If we could secure perfect competition, I should believe in the law of supply and demand as likely to settle all difficulties concerning capital and labour. But here is a difference of wages between the north and south of England. You say the law of supply and demand will right things. Yes; it would right things with a bale of goods. There lies a bale of cotton on the wharf at Liverpool, and the difference of a penny in profits, as Adam Smith used to say, will carry it to the north of England or the south, to France or Germany, or perhaps around the world. But if, instead of a bale of cotton, there is a poor man's family on the wharf, the difference of a penny in profits will not produce these marvels. The labourer, it may be, has not heard of the higher wages at a distance. What if he has heard, and has not money enough to get there? What if he has money enough, but cannot leave his family? What if he can leave his family, but is too old to learn a new trade? In seven cases out of ten working-men must sell their labour promptly or starve; but capital can wait. Competition is enormously imperfect in this case, and the law of supply and demand has no free course. Nevertheless, state interference at all these points would cripple the workman, and competition can be improved safely only by his self-

* Roscher, "*Political Economy*," vol. I. p. 246, note.

help. We know how callow the pauper becomes. Every bone in the beneficiary is filled with extra joints. It is impossible to make the empty bag stand on its own bottom. You may pour in state-help ages and ages, without filling the socialistic bag; and until self-help gives it a bottom the filling will be useless. The rights of the labourer are safe only in his own hands and through self-help. On account of the imperfections in the working of competition, the working-men should beware of letting the spirit of self-help sleep. It is self-help that gives the working class building societies, and trades-unions, rightly managed, and co-operation and industrial partnerships. The political demagogues who would lead us away from these measures to the support of schemes of state-help are the enemies of social progress.

In the thousand exigencies of industry the working-man has no adequate defence but intelligence, energy, and honesty, used in self-help. New machinery revolutionizes some trade, and you have no work for a time. Thousands are turned out of employment, and what are you to do? If a working-man in the fluctuating industries is to be sure of a home, he needs to know more than one trade, or, at least, a portion of his family must know more than one. No political power is able to resist the progress of new inventions, and labour must be made mobile and capable of changing its position from occupation to occupation. The trouble with manual labour is that there is more of it in the world than is wanted, and if it cannot change itself into skilled labour, manual labour must sometimes see distress. I want interference by government for those who cannot help themselves, for the children, for the women in the mine, for the girl in the shop; but for men who, under republican government, are to be called on to manage themselves politically, I want such industrial custom that in industry they shall be called on to depend on precisely what they depend on in politics—namely, self-help. Until that spirit is exhibited by our working-men we shall never see what co-operation, and industrial partnerships, and the self-inspired mobility of labour, can do.

Two summits are in view above the height to which our discussion has led us, and I here and now can only point to them, and ask you to ascend them, and look abroad from them, and pace to and fro on them, each one of you silently and alone.

19. The Church, in all its branches, while inculcating philanthropy, insists everywhere on self-help; and in doing this she proves herself to be the chief friend of the poor.

20. Socialism, by destroying the right of personal ownership in the means of production and by fostering dependence on state-help, undermines the spirit of self-help, and so is a fatal enemy of the cause of the poor.

CO-OPERATION THE HELP OF THE POOR.

The Prelude.—The Chinese Question.

San Francisco, a brave city, hardly dares utter her mind on the Chinese question, when her sand-lot orators threaten conflagration, riot, and murder. Loafers and roughs, led by a gang of shallow and foul-mouthed cheap-jacks, mostly of foreign birth, fill the ears of Californians daily with threats of fire, blood and devastation. I am a friend of the working-man; but not of rioters, tramps, thieves, sneaks, and thugs. Anti-Chinese clubs crack the defiant whip of lawlessness over the heads of California's mayors, governors, and senators. This business may succeed for a day and an hour in a city famed once for its deadly Vigilance Committee; but it will not succeed in the long course of events. It may succeed with one state, under a corrupt legislature; but it will not succeed with the nation. San Francisco is afraid of her sand-lots. Massachusetts is not. She has seen their chief orator. The leader of sand-lot oratory, by his odious advocacy, sunk an astute popular leader beneath the sea of Massachusetts politics. No political party can swim in Eastern waters with Kearneyism hung around its neck. The supporters in Congress of an unconstitutional bill against Chinese emigration should remember that their action may some day hang about their necks a millstone, and that they may wish, as the Massachusetts politician did on the day of his defeat, that his principal supporter were not only on the sand-lots, but under them.

The three despised races on this Continent are the Negroes, the Indians, and the Chinese. That part of the nation which did justice to the first of these races will ultimately do justice to the others. The crack of the hoodlum's lash in national politics is too much like that of the slave-driver's whip to be popular, and it is near enough like it to be its echo. I doubt whether the crack of the whip of the hoodlum is much more agreeable to the Supreme Powers above us than the sound of the slave-driver's lash was. A craven and apologetic attitude before the latter has not been justified by history, and as little will a similar crouching attitude before the former be an object of admiration to posterity. The sound of the slave-driver's whip has passed out of hearing, and so will that of the hoodlum's sibilant thongs. The chief danger from each is in the tendency of cowardice and ease, under threats, to depart from straightforward justice and fall into fright and compromise.

Only three men of national reputation for statesmanship have thus far expressed an opinion on the Chinese question. When Secretary Seward was in California, on his trip around the world, he was asked to visit the Chinese quarter, in order to convince himself that Chinese immigration was fast poisoning California. He was invited by the Chinese themselves to visit the same quarter, in order to see how industrious and harmless and profitable that colonization is in this country. He refused to accept either invitation; but took pains to put on record his firm protest against the exclusive policy so loudly insisted upon by small partisans, and his conviction that immigration and expansion are the main and inseparable elements of civilization on the American continent, and nowhere more so than on the Pacific Coast. Any attempt to stifle or suppress these invigorating forces, he

thought, must certainly fail. We need good police regulations, no doubt, for Chinamen and hoodlums; we need better enforcements of existing laws; but Seward was of opinion that there is no change needed in the Constitution of the United States on account of the desire of the sand-lot working-men for a monopoly of cheap labour in California. Senator Morton, the chairman, and the only strong man of the congressional committee sent to California in 1876 to investigate the Chinese question, is the second statesman who has taken this position. The greatest orator of New England, with all the emphasis of his glorious, life-long career, has put himself on the side of the oppressed in California. He regards the anti-Chinese crusade as one of the most heartless and contemptible attacks that one class of low-paid labourers has ever made on another. Only O'Connell himself, he thinks, could properly ridicule the Irish and the German immigrant, the Dutch, the Bohemian, Pole, Swede, who, not yet naturalized in this country, or whose fathers were unknown here, are attacking other immigrants as not Americans. Mr. Phillips is not usually charged with lack of sympathy for working-men; but he has had the courage to disagree utterly with sand-lot oratory.

The courage of Seward, of Morton, and of Phillips, has not been imitated in Congress. What is the trouble with the majority of the Lower House at Washington? Everybody understands, or ought to, that the congressional and presidential votes of California are prizes held up and shaken in the face of politicians. These glittering baubles have so confused the mind of the majority of the Lower House that, by a vote of 155 to 72, they have denied the right of any American shipmaster to bring to this country more than fifteen Chinamen at a time. I am not taking ground against all limitations of Chinese immigration. If there should ever be an avalanche from China, or from any other country, perhaps we might moderate it a little; but there is no call yet for effort in that direction—except from politicians in search of capital! The majority in the Lower House at Washington, acting under the party whip, is ready to violate treaty stipulations with a friendly power. The House of Representatives holds up the Burlingame Treaty as a paper Chinese lantern, and, at the prompting of hoodlums, delivers a blow through it into the face of China. This is not action fit for Congress. If approved by the Senate and the Executive, it would bring reprisals in China. American trade can be shut out of Chinese ports. Great Britain is the owner of the port of Hong Kong, and we are likely to be brought into collision with the British power if we put too many restrictions upon the action of shipmasters in British waters. I suppose we have no more right to restrict the action of a shipmaster in Hong Kong than in Liverpool harbour. It is a place covered by a British treaty with the United States. Then, again, how silly is the idea, several times proclaimed in a late congressional debate, that it takes only one nation to make a treaty. One nation can make a law; but it takes two nations to make a treaty, and a treaty, as we have been taught, is a part of the supreme law of the land.

There is a provision that the sixteenth emigrant who offers himself for passage on any American vessel shall be excluded. When the Chinese embassy came across the Pacific, it had more than fifty in its train, and could not have been brought on one ship, according to the proposed legislation. If ever the Chinese emperor should send another embassy, we should be obliged to bring them on several vessels, under this new regulation. There is ludicrous inappositeness, too, in such hasty action on the part of the Lower House, when the Upper House and Lower, together with the President, were in correspondence with China on the topic of this treaty. There is a Chinese embassy, too, in Washington; but, under the spur of a desire to catch congressional and presidential votes from the Pacific

Coast, a political party has committed itself to the Chinese policy of building a Chinese wall.

The lesser Eastern question has become the greater. What is the lesser Eastern question? The fate of Turkey on the Bosphorus. What is the greater? The regeneration of Asia. The Chinese question in California is an outlying portion of the greater Eastern problem. As such I, for one, always look upon this burning American topic, and find in it only the portico to the immense international topic—a greater Eastern problem of colossal proportions—the regeneration of Asia. California a door to Asia! The meeting of the vanguard of civilization in its march toward the West with the old conditions of men yet existing in the rear-guard in the East! The front rank of the army likely to suffer somewhat, indeed; but the rear ranks urging on the front! California so placed that she cannot evade commercial intimacy with China! California called on to take into her hands the carrying trade of the Pacific! California compelled to educate Chinamen, that they may educate their own land! California called on to do justice in America, in order that ultimately we may have a moral foothold to produce regeneration for Asia as a whole! That is the Chinese question as our Sumner saw it when the Chinese embassy came here. You put the representatives of China into Faneuil Hall. You gave them a banquet, with your most honoured public men. You put at the side of the Chinese ministers Mr. Emerson, Mr. Sumner, and Mr. Burlingame, of whom you were then proud; but whose measures are now being attacked in Congress by fifth and tenth-rate politicians as unwise. He had opened commercial gates of China, and you had enthusiasm in Boston as to the possibilities of the future. Rufus Choate was once greatly praised for saying: "The gates of the Rocky Mountains are opening, on golden hinges turning." You thought, when the Chinese embassy came here, and you put your Sumner and your Emerson at their side, to point out the signs of the times—that the great gates of the Pacific were opening, and that the day might come which Carlyle has predicted, when the Pacific will be to the modern world only what the Mediterranean was to the Roman Empire.

You send a letter around the world in ninety-six days. Cæsar could not drive around the Mediterranean in less than a hundred. If there were unities of a deep political sort among the nations in the old Roman Empire, why may there not be unities of a deep, commercial sort, at least, among the nations surrounding the greater Mediterranean which we call the Pacific? The regeneration of Asia! Why, it has as much practical value to us in Christian and commercial and political discussion as the regeneration of any outlying province of old Rome had to the Empire in Cæsar's day. We are as near China as Cæsar was to the Straits of Gibraltar. We are as near Japan as Cæsar was to the cataracts of the Nile. Indeed, if you measure space by the time needed to traverse it, the whole world's circuit now is not greater than that of the Mediterranean was in his day. Our missionaries on a thousand hillsides in the desolate quarters of Chinese paganism regard it as settled that there are no foreign lands. Our ocean transit, our railway transit, are becoming so perfect that the world no longer is a system of land-locked lakes. It is one ocean. The voice of Almighty Providence, calling for the regeneration of China, contrasts itself, as the greatest modern political and religious theme, with this small, piping cry of a narrow-minded anti-Chinese crusade on the Pacific Coast. To which will you listen—to the crack of the hoodlum's whip, or to the voice of Providence requiring America to do justice and to occupy her opportunities? The question is whether you will listen to what God has said in our history concerning despised races, and take instruction from the penalties we have suffered for injustice in the past, and do your duty

at this time to a race not with 4,000,000 in it, but with 400,000,000. The greater Eastern question presents an exigency which, in its relation to the whole world has an importance comparable to the importance belonging to the slavery contest in our own land.

You say that when I take this point of view I suggest precisely the reason why we should be cautious about an immense Chinese immigration. Four hundred millions of people in the Chinese Empire! Can they not easily spare fifty millions, or as many as we now have in the United States? Is it not a question whether the United States will become New China? I face that enquiry; but, if you please, we must be wary of statistics, when none have been taken in the Chinese Empire for a hundred years. Rather more than a century ago statistics were collected showing that China had two hundred millions of people, and I know the standard writers on statistics say there are now between four and five hundred millions of people in China; but our last information is that this is a great over-estimate. I hold in my hands here a summary of the very remarkable letters just published in San Francisco by a Chinese mandarin and literate of the first rank. He is perhaps a politician; but he has succeeded in shaking public confidence as to the average estimated population of China. He thinks the population of the Celestial Empire has decreased in the last hundred years. His conclusion is that probably there are not two hundred millions of people in China to-day. There has been no census taken in China for the last hundred years, simply because it was supposed a deficit in the population would be revealed. I presume that the estimates by this mandarin are under the mark; nevertheless, I confess my conscience is shaken in the statement that there are between four and five hundred millions in China.

The danger of an avalanche of Chinese emigrants is vastly exaggerated. What has happened? We have had twenty years of Chinese emigration, and there are only about 200,000 Chinese now in the country. There has been no barrier to emigration. There has been a great field for cheap labour in Pacific railway construction. We have received in twenty years fewer Asiatic emigrants than we often receive of European emigrants in a single year. If in the last twenty years, under all the stimulation of emigration, we have brought over but this small number, how are we sure that American institutions are to be buried under an immense avalanche of Asiatic emigrants in the time just ahead of us? I believe that the bugbear of the enormous avalanche from China is absurdly emphasized. It is a hoodlum bogey. It ought not to frighten us, even if it be magnified by political necromancers. Our population is doubling every thirty years. We are soon to have a hundred million people here, born on our soil. The man who remembers that we have two hundred thousand from Europe every year landing on this Atlantic coast, and is frightened by the landing of the same number from the Asiatic coast on the Pacific side during fifteen or twenty years, is not estimating at its proper value the recuperative vigour of the American nation. We have succeeded on the Atlantic seaboard, we have succeeded even in New York City, in holding our heads above water while the Irish deluge and the German has come in. We have the fifth German city in the world at the mouth of the Hudson; we have the second Irish city in the world there; and yet we are not altogether ashamed of New York. More than half the imports of the United States yet pass through her harbour and she is yet an American city. We shall be proud of San Francisco if she manages an immigration half as large as well as New York has done her Irish and German and Italian and Polish and Bohemian influx.

I beg leave to insist upon the fact that the Chinese emigration thus far has

done more and far more for this country, financially, than the Irish did when the Irish was no larger. We have official statistics showing that 60,000 Chinese now in California contribute to the annual revenue of the state over 15,000,000 dollars. Did any 60,000 Irishmen among the first who came over do as much as that? Let us have the truth on this topic, no matter whose prejudices are offended. We have official information that the amount of duties paid by the Chinese importers into the custom-house of the port of San Francisco is 1,800,000 dollars; freight and passage money in ships from China, 650,000 dollars; rent for stores and storage, 1,000,000 dollars; for state licenses and taxes, 2,250,000 dollars; for American products in San Francisco, 1,100,000 dollars; forwater-rates for Chinese miners, 2,200,000 dollars; for mining claims bought by Chinese miners, 1,350,000 dollars; for American products in the state, 5,000,000 dollars.*

The surveyor-general of California says the Chinese have increased the value of the property in California 290,000,000 dollars, and this property to-day is held by white men. Have any 200,000 Irish done as much as that for California? Where is the sand-lot orator that dare say that his race on the Pacific Coast has added 290,000,000 dollars in value within ten years to the property in California held by white men? These Chinamen have, according to official statements, reclaimed a million acres of marsh-lands which were worth 3 dollars an acre and now are worth 100 dollars an acre and each one producing seventy-five bushels of wheat. These enterprises have given employment to 500,000 white men, and these men now turn on their benefactors. I undertake to say that there has not been on the face of the globe since the first emigration of the English to this country as profitable an emigration as these official figures show.

If I speak of justice to capital, I shall be accused, of course, of being bought. As I heard the sand-lot orator say once—and it is the best thing I ever heard him utter: "There is not money enough in the United States to buy a hair of my head." I have been criticising capital here until I have shown, at least, my impartiality. If you go into California, as scores of my friends who have brought me information have done, you will find that capital at large, as represented by the great managers of manufactories and ranches and extensive farms, is in favour of Chinese immigration, under good police regulations in San Francisco and fair construction of the Burlingame Treaty. On the whole, the substantial part of the population of California speak of Chinese emigration favourably. This morning a gentleman who had spent months in San Francisco told me he had talked with at least a hundred owners of property and leaders of public sentiment—preachers, professors, teachers, merchants,—and that he had not, in his long residence in San Francisco, found one man or woman opposed to Chinese immigration. It is very well understood not only that there are two sentiments on this topic in California; but the reason why the more conservative sentiment does not make itself heard is because sand-lot oratory threatens riot and conflagration, and is so little under the control of the San Francisco police that the city sleeps as it were on its musket. There is not a Church with any spiritual life in it on the Pacific Coast that has not a class in

---

* Among the official documents which must be compared on the Chinese question are Senator Morton's minority report and that of the majority in the Committee of Investigation in California in 1876, the California state publications, and the memorials sent to Congress by the six Chinese companies. See also Kwang Chang Ling's letters to the San Francisco *Argonaut*, and the Rev. O. Gibson's volume on "The Chinese in America."

its Sunday-school for Chinamen. The certainty is that more than three thousand Chinese answer to the roll-call in evening mission schools in San Francisco and study successfully the English language. Over three thousand attend Sabbath-school; a thousand, it is supposed, have accepted Christianity; it is certain, at least, that more than four hundred have been baptized. There are a thousand Chinese children born in this country. We have two hundred Chinese students in American colleges and preparatory schools, and some of them out-rank our best boys.

Do you say that there can be no assimilation between the races? Nitro-glycerine! That is the proper metaphor for the relation of Irishmen to Chinese; and because this topic is so explosive we are asked by a few ministers in San Francisco—I believe it is said we are asked by the General Association of Congregational Churches there—to adopt the exculsive policy.

There are Orangemen in Eastern cities who do not like other Irishmen; and there is collision here between these two ranks of our citizens. We have had bloodshed here in the Orange riots. Are we to debar Irish immigration on account of this local difficulty? Nitro-glycerine! We have enough of it in New York City, and explosions occur there often. On account of the explosive relations of the sand-lots and the Chinamen, are we to take the side of the sand-lots? Why, what we do in the East here is to put our hand a little roughly on the shoulders of both Orangeman and his opponent and say: "Peace! order!" If the mayor of San Francisco, if the governor of California wishes to represent the sentiment that will carry the votes of the serious parts of this land; if there is to be union between the best politicians of California and the best of the country in the next presidential election, the thing for San Francisco to do is to keep order, not only in Chinatown, but on the sand-lots; to seize by the nape of the neck the mobocracy and the hoodlum quarter of San Francisco, and, if necessary, by the nape of the neck the Chinese quarter also; but, at any hazard, to keep both in order, to preserve the fundamental principles of our national policy, and to make first pure and then peaceable the Pacific Coast, so far as it is trod by cheap labour.

The Pacific Coast needs manufactures. Labour is so costly in California that manufactures there cannot compete with the East. The influx of Chinese labour will make it possible to apply capital advantageously to the diversification of industry in California.

The Chinaman's standard of living will grow higher. His competition with the American labourer will thus become less dangerous and excite less class rancour.

I have an aspiration concerning the Pacific Coast, as well as the Atlantic, and John Bright expressed it: "There is another and far brighter vision before me," this friend of the working poor and of free institutions said, in a speech at Birmingham, December 18th, 1862, in the darkest days of our civil war, when aristocrats hoped for the division of the American Union. "I see one vast confederation, stretching from the frozen North in unbroken line to the torrid Sonth, and from the wild billows of the Atlantic westward to the calmer waters of the Pacific main; and I see one people, one language, one law and one faith, and over that wide continent the home of freedom and a refuge for the oppressed of every race and clime."

The Lecture.

Go to the town of Rochdale, near Manchester, England, and you will find an immense establishment, called a co-operative store. You are an American traveller, and do not understand what this institution has done; and here is a poor English labourer who is ignorant as to the results of co-operation among the poor. You take him as your companion and step into the establishment; and he looks about, and asks you in a whisper: "Was all this done by poor folks like me?" A clerk comes forward, and answers the question by saying: "All that you see here belongs entirely to working-men. The store

which you have come to visit originated with the poor, and with the poorest of the poor."

We walk with the clerk from room to room, and he points out the strategic quarters of the establishment. Here comes a poor widow, and she buys five dollars' worth of flour and meat and cloth. "Yes," says the poor English labourer; "but I see that she has to pay for everything in cash." "So she does," says the clerk. "Nothing is sold here except for ready money; but wait and watch the whole operation." The widow gets a tin certificate, showing that she has paid five dollars, or a pound, for goods at this store. She puts that into her portemonnaie and goes away. The clerk calls attention to the fact that there is no credit given here. "That may be a good thing," says the poor man. "There is not much encouragement here to get into debt." "No," says the clerk; "and we have no bad debts, because there is no credit. We can do a large business on a small capital, for we turn our money over often." The labourer asks: "Does that widow yonder, purchasing her goods, obtain them at a less cost than she could at the ordinary shops?" The clerk replies: "We save all that we should have to pay middlemen to manage this business. We save bad debts. We save an immense amount in advertising, because our customers, especially if they are shareholders, are sure to come here. We save all the profits that in ordinary management of business would go to the retail trader."

Our poor man wants to know how he can become a member of this institution, and whether he can at once have the benefit of this new arrangement of trade; and the clerk tells him that by paying a small sum he can be recognized as a shareholder, can have a part in the management of the business; or that if he saves his tin tickets, representing the amount of his purchases, and there is a profit on the business, then, even if he is not a shareholder, he will get a part of the profit proportioned to the amount of his purchases. "This poor widow," says the clerk, "buys in the course of the quarter twenty-five dollars' worth of goods, and there comes a time when profits are divided. She brings in her tin tickets as proof of the amount of her purchases; and she gets part of the dividend, even if she is not a shareholder. If she is a shareholder she has the choice to take her dividend and put it in her pocket, or to leave it in the establishment, as so much new stock, to draw further dividend in time to come.

The clerk informs us that the Rochdale co-operative store began with a few weavers, in 1844. The Rochdale pioneers were merely weavers, who in a distressed period of the flannel trade thought it possible to club their means together, twenty-eight of them, and to purchase tea and sugar at wholesale prices, and then sell it *to* each

other at retail prices, *and unadulterated!* Thank God that the topic of adulteration of food has lately been scientifically discussed in Boston; and now we know that when poisoners take their places behind counters they poison the poor in preference to the rich, but by no means wholly spare the latter. All adulterations, I believe, injure the poor more than the rich, and that is not only because the poor are obliged to buy in small parcels and cannot be particular about the quality of their purchases, but because they have less power to make themselves heard in complaint.

This co-operative society, the clerks tells us, had in 1857 a capital of 12,000,000 dollars. It has for years had a wholesale department, and this has a business worth more than 10,000,000 dollars per annum. This department transacts business with 590 subsidiary cooperative stores, and in expending more than 10,000,000 dollars per annum loses less than 200 dollars by bad debts. The cost of management, the clerk says is, only one per cent. on the returns. He asks us to notice that the number of co-operative societies in England and Wales is 746, and the number of members more than 300,000. At the end of 1872 the share capital amounted to more than 13,900,000 dollars. During that year 55,000,000 dollars were received, and 50,000,000 dollars expended for goods. The net profit from all these sources was more than 4,000,000 dollars.*

"Will you give me a document concerning this establishment?" says the poor labourer. "I wish to tell my friends of the results of the Rochdale enterprise, and its imitation in England." And I, as an American traveller, ask for the same documents. I say: "America is inventive, but co-operative stores have not had great prominence with us as yet. Perhaps there will be some use for these documents even in Massachusetts." The visit of the poor working-man and of the American traveller to the Rochdale co-operative store has thus resulted in our both going away with a pile of documents under our arms and a new star in our hearts; a star of hope for the poor, so far as co-operative distribution is concerned.

Co-operative production has not stood very well in England; but, as an American traveller, I look across the Channel, and find it has succeeded in France. There is another kind of co-operation that concerns banking. It has succeeded well neither in England nor in France, but it has in Germany, and so, by enlarging my view, I come to these three propositions:—

1. In England there has been for thirty years great success in societies of co-operative consumption.

* Compare Brassey, "Lectures on the Labour Question," London, 1878, p. 113, with Fawcett, "Manual of Political Economy," chap. x.

2. In France there has been for twenty-five years great success in societies of co-operative production.

3. In Germany there has been for twenty years great success in societies for co-operative credit.

So vast a theme can be glanced at here and now only in outlines, and I shall confine myself to-day to co-operative consumption.

These are the rules of the Rochdale co-operative store :—

1. No credit. Payment in cash.

2. Goods bought at wholesale and sold at ordinary retail prices.

3. Tin tickets or tallies given to each customer, to record the amount of his purchases.

4. After a dividend of five per cent. has been allotted to capital, the surplus profits are divided among customers in proportion to the amount of their purchases.

5. Two and one-half per cent. of the profits is devoted to education. A very valuable library belongs to the Rochdale establishment.

What are the advantages of a co-operative store?

It ill becomes me to follow the king. We are this morning honoured by the presence of the patriot and statesman, Mr. Quincy, who is founding a co-operative store in Boston. I remember what his ancestors did for New England and for the United States. But we are all agreed in thinking that in founding institutions here for co-operative purchase and sale, and for co-operative loans and banking, he is acting quite as significantly as ever his ancestors did, or as ever he did when standing in the breach and teaching the nation its duty concerning slavery. In co-operation is the opening, I believe, or certainly a wicket-gate, into the path towards the promised land for honest labour. I am no Socialist; but I am a Labour Reformer. I am in favour of co-operation. And when grave men, with the weight of mighty careers upon them, come forward, and in this city, not given to running after floating bubbles, advocate these schemes which have had so much success in England and France and Germany, I hope I shall be able to defend them without being subjected to the charge of opening a way to socialistic errors.

A co-operative store, arranged on the Rochdale plan, has these advantages :

1. It has no bad debts.

2. As all the goods are paid for across the counter, a maximum of business can be carried on with a minimum of capital.

3. No credit is given and none need be received. Under a system of credit the poorest are usually taxed fifteen or twenty per cent. to compensate the tradesmen for losses incurred through the dishonest. Credit leads to improvidence. The expense of solicitation of payment is saved by the abolition of the credit system.

4. The stock bought is sure to be taken by purchasers, and so waste and loss are reduced.

5. Frauds in weight, measure, and adulteration are provided against; and it is from these that the poorest consumers in ordinary trades suffer more than the rich.

6. Efficiency and economy of time in securing customers are secured.

7. Fair prices are the only ones possible.

8. All the larger expenses of advertising, bill-posting, and of costly shop-windows, elaborate lighting apparatus, and high rents are greatly diminished.

9. A spirit of self-help is promoted among working-men.

10. There is divided among the co-operators the ordinary net profit of the retail trade.

The protective union stores, which were in vogue in parts of this country a few years ago, are an altogether different affair from the Rochdale associations. The method of conducting the former very often led to disaster. But I believe that there will be, within a few months, a co-operative store in Boston, avoiding all the errors of the earlier establishments called union stores, and gathering up all the wisdom of the thirty years' experience of Great Britain in these establishments, and putting on foot here in New England soil this young giant, who may have a career before him all the way from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Here are four central passages from an official copy of the bye-laws of the Boston Co-operative Store, organized November 12th, 1878:—

"Art. XIV. All purchases and sales shall be for cash only. Each purchaser shall be given a voucher, to be called a dividend check, showing the amount of his purchase. The directors shall prescribe the form, size, material, and manner of issue of all such vouchers, and may alter the voucher or the manner of issue at their discretion. Vouchers issued to purchasers during a certain quarter shall not be entitled to dividend upon sales of any other quarter.

"Art. XV. The managing committee shall have special supervision of the affairs of any or all stores established by the directors. They shall draw money-orders upon the treasurer for the payment of bills previously approved by them, and all such orders shall be signed by the president and one of the committee, or, in case of the president's absence or inability, the order shall be signed by two of the committee. Any vacancy on the committee shall be filled by the directors.

"Art. XVI. There shall be a quarterly adjustment of interest and profits. At each periodic stock-taking all the shares shall be credited with interest at the rate of six per centum per annum upon their par value, provided that the directors may, at their discretion, by special

vote, fix the date from which time the first interest upon the shares shall be computed. If it shall then appear that there has been a net loss, the entire amount of such loss shall be debited to the shares *pro rata*. If, after crediting the shares with six per cent. interest, there shall appear to be a net profit, the contingent fund shall be credited with such a percentage of it as may be required by law, and the balance then remaining shall be transferred to an account to be called purchasers' dividend, and shall be disposed of by the directors, who shall be governed by the following rules :

"1. They shall declare a percentage of dividend based upon the sales during the period, entitling the purchasers to 'whole dividends' and 'half dividends,' and excluding the class indicated in rule 5.

"2. Of the total amount of vouchers for each particular class of purchases handed in by any one person, at the end of any financial quarter, no dividend shall be paid upon a fractional part of a dollar.

"3. Non-shareholding purchasers shall be paid a dividend only upon one-half the amount of their purchases.

"4th. The financial quarters shall end on the last days of February, May, August, and November.

"5th. The directors may at their discretion exclude wholly or partially from participation in the profits such articles as in their judgment pay little or no profits.

"6th. The percentage of dividends declared shall not include a fractional part of one per cent., nor shall the undivided amount exceed a fractional part of one per cent.

"7th. All purchasers' dividends shall be paid on demand by the treasurer, at such fixed times as the directors shall prescribe.

"8th. All purchasers' dividends remaining unpaid at the expiration of the fourth quarter next succeeding their declaration shall be forfeited to the corporation.

9th. The undivided portion, and any portion remaining by reason of the exclusion of fractional parts of a dollar (see rule two), and any portion remaining by reason of the loss or non-presentation of dividend checks by purchasers, shall be added to the contingent fund at the end of the quarter.

"Art. XVII. All interest credit to shareholders upon their shares shall be payable on demand, at such fixed times as the directors shall prescribe, and shall not be compounded."

Everybody sees that customers are likely to go to co-operative stores if the customers are shareholders, or if, by taking certificates to the extent of their purchases, they can be sure to receive a portion of any profits that are made. They are certain to go to the co-operative store, whether it is advertised or not. You may put it on a back street. You need not put a rum-shop in its basement, to draw men to it, nor a gambling-hell in its attic. You need not depend on elaborate shop-windows to get you trade. You need not pay drummers to torment the land. There is an immense reduction of expense on these few items ; but the great point is that whatever you would pay to the middle-men you put into the co-operators' pockets.

I am not altogether opposed to the middle-men. It can be shown I think, that the Supreme Powers are in favour of captains of industry—when there is real work for them; but only then! There must be somebody to think, somebody to plan; and the necessary managers ought to have a salary.

You will pay a good salary to the clerk in your co-operative store; but he is under the eye of the master whenever he is under the eye of a customer. Every time a shareholder comes in, the man feels that he is in the presence of one of his employers. Even the poor purchaser who takes a tin certificate and looks forward to a dividend, although he is not a shareholder, is in some sense a task-master, with his eye on the right or wrong performance of the duties of the clerk. Thus we have efficiency and economy in the management of a co-operative store. The great points in favour of co-operative societies for the purchase and sale of ordinary goods are the distribution of the larger part of the profits of the middle-men to the customers, and the abolition of credit.

If you could be guaranteed against all bad debts, you could sell your goods lower. There is a civil service store in London that sells goods for twenty per cent. less than other stores, and when a price-list of that store was shown to a trader in Manchester, he said: "I ask more because I must practise the credit system. If you will insure me against bad debts as perfectly as that co-operative store at Rochdale or this civil service store is protected against them by their no-credit system, then I will sell twenty per cent. lower, and have a larger income than now; otherwise, I must tax the honest men to make me safe against the rogues."

Thirty years of history point to six conclusions. Co-operation

1. Obviates strikes.
2. Stimulates the workman to industry and carefulness.
3. Incites him to frugality.
4. Improves his moral, social, and political character.
5. Provides for him employment independently of the will of the middle-man.
6. Gives him the middle-man's share of the profits.*

What is the difference between the co-operator and the communist? The communist depends on state-help; the co-operator on self-help. There is the leader of New England co-operators (turning to Mr. Quincy), and I beg you to contrast his guidance with that of socialistic and communistic errorists and demagogues. Compare socialism with co-operation, state-help with self-help, Lassalle with Schulze-Delitzsch, Karl Marx with John Bright.

> "What is a communist? One who hath yearnings
> For equal division of unequal earnings.
> Idler or bungler, or both, he is willing
> To fork out his penny and pocket your shilling."
>
> —*Corn Law Rhyme.*

* See Walker and Fawcett on Co-operation.

CO-OPERATIVE SAVINGS BANKS AS A HELP TO THE POOR.

Prelude.—The Sale of Women in Alaska.

Alaska is under the direct control of Congress, and yet women are sold there into slavery and other conditions to which death is preferable. The Alaska mother not infrequently takes her female infant into the fields, and fills its mouth with grass and leaves it to die, and justifies herself by saying before God that she wishes she had been treated in the same way. Alaska, as most of us may have pictured it to ourselves, is so cold that it can have no interest to us and no importance to the nation. Mr. Dall, of Boston, who has written the standard work on Alaska, tells us that on half the coast of the territory the thermometer never has been known to fall below zero. He thinks no polar bear ever came within a thousand miles of Sitka.* Mr. Sumner was accustomed to cite the experience of navigators who would moor their barks along the Alaskan shore and through the whole winter never find the ice strong enough to make a bridge from their vessels to the land.

The isotherm of 50 deg. of average annual temperature runs through Sitka. It passes also through Lake Superior and Quebec. Captain Cook, who one hundred years ago last year saw and named Mt. St. Elias, said that cattle might exist in Oonalaska all the year round without being housed. The mean temperature of winter in Alaska, as estimated by the Smithsonian Institution, is 32.30 deg., while that of summer is 53.37 deg. The Washington winter is 33.57 deg., and the Washington summer 73.07 deg. The winters of Alaska do not differ much from those of Washington, although the summers are colder. The winter of Sitka is milder than that of St. Petersburg or Berlin or Boston.† On the Upper Yukon in midsummer the thermometer sometimes stands at 112 deg., and the traveller blesses the transient coolness of the midnight air.

The westernmost territory of the United States lies further beyond San Francisco towards the sunset than the easternmost does on this side towards the sunrise. As Guyot has said, San Francisco is the middle city in the United States. Take the meridian line running through San Francisco, and follow it northward to a point on the same parallel with the Island of Atton, in the Aleutian Archipelago. Measure the distance from this meridian westward to that island (illustrating on Berghaus's Chart of the World), and you will find it greater than that from the same meridian eastward to the bay of Fundy. The Island of Atton, which belongs to the United States, is further towards the sunset beyond San Francisco than the coast of Maine is towards the sunrise. When this morning I covered Alaska on my globe, and then plucked up the screen, which had its four corners at the Mt. St. Elias, and on the Arctic Ocean, and at Behring's Straits, and at the Island of Atton, and put down the screen upon the United States, I found all our Union covered east of the Mississippi and north of the Carolinas and Alabama. Take

---

* Dall, "Alaska," p. 242.

† Compare Sumner's Works, Vol. XI., p. 281, with Dall, "Alaska," p. 437.

what there is of the United States east of the Mississippi and cut off the Gulf States, and all that is left is no larger than this territory of Alaska.

In 1872 Alaska was annexed to Washington Territory, for governmental purposes, as a county. Its officers are appointed at Washington, and it is to their misrule that this audience is requested to direct their blistering attention. Your Charles Sumner had no views of a grandiloquent sort concerning Alaska. Your Seward estimated correctly the importance of this region, and so did the nation, when, under his lead, the Government paid for it more than seven million dollars. The Pacific Coast is singularly destitute of harbours. It can no longer be said, now that we possess Alaska, that three gunboats can blockade our whole Pacific seaboard. The natural route to China and Japan, after the completion of the Northern Pacific Railroad, will be through the North Pacific. From San Francisco to Hong Kong by the way to Honolulu the distance is 7,140 miles; but by the way of the Aleutian Isles only 6,060.

You will pardon me if I call attention to the reasons why Alaska is so warm. Everybody understands that the continents are tally-ho coaches driving towards the sunrise, and that the wind blows in the faces of those who sit on the front seats of coaches. The wind that bore Columbus across the Atlantic and Magellan across the Pacific, blows in the faces of the tally-ho coaches of the continents driving out of the sunset into the sunrise. As the trade-winds in the Tropics blow from east to west at a speed often reaching fifteen or eighteen miles an hour, they produce a current in the ocean moving in the same direction across the tropical zone. When that current strikes the east side of a continent it divides, and part goes north and part south. As the portion moving toward the Pole flows away from the Tropics, it, of course, reaches a part of the earth moving with less rapidity than that from which it came. Everybody sees that the Equator must revolve with far greater rapidity than the Arctic Circle, simply because it is larger and must turn around in the same time. The motion of the earth decreases from the Equator to the Pole. As the warm current passes from the Equator to the North Sea in our Atlantic Basin, it is constantly transferring itself to parallels that move less rapidly than those which it left at its last place of departure. The water does not at once lose the speed of eastern motion it had nearer the Equator, and so slips eastward faster than the northern water it meets. Thus arises a translation of a great body of water toward the sunrise. In this way originates the Gulf Current, the cause of which was a mystery for ages. So in the Pacific Ocean, under the sweep of the trade-winds and the influence of the difference of temperature between the torrid and the northern waters, there is produced an enormous equatorial current, moving from east to west. On reaching the Asiatic coast and islands, a part of this vast stream goes north and a part south. The portion which goes north is, of course, always dropping into latitudes where the motion of the earth is less rapid; and, therefore, there is a translation of the waters toward America. Thus springs up a gulf current in the Pacific.* It pours out of the East Indies, as ours does out of the West Indies. It laves the coast of China and Japan, as ours does that of America. It is called the Japan Current or Black Water, and further on it has the name of the North Pacific Current. It divides at the westernmost end of the Aleutian Islands. A part of it runs through Behring's Straits. That is the reason why ice never drifts through those Straits into the Pacific, and why the transit for steamers between China and the United States is likely to be free from icebergs. The larger part of the current goes south of the Aleutian Archipelago, and strikes our continent first on the

* Guyot, "Physical Geography," p. 65.

coast of Alaska. As the Gulf Current warms England, so does the North Pacific Current warm Alaska and Oregon. But the Atlantic is more open to the Arctic Sea than the Pacific is, and so the latter current is less cooled by cold water from the north than the former.

The climate of Alaska is so wet that you cannot burn the forests on the mountain-sides near Sitka. Naturally enough, the trees of the region attain a gigantic size. Some of you have put your hand on the Alaskan canoe exhibited in the collection of curious objects at Philadelphia in our Centennial. The boat that I saw there was fifty or sixty feet long, and made of a single tree, and it was said to be capable of carrying sixty or seventy men. Travellers tell us that sometimes trees in Alaska are cut down out of which boats can be made large enough to carry one hundred men. You find a sound tree, cut it down, hollow it, then fill it with water, put canvas over the structure, and make the water boil by throwing in hot stones. That softens the wood. Then you spread apart the sides, and produce a form of beautiful symmetry, and thus you construct the famous Alaskan canoe.

> "Lo! to the wintry winds the pilot yields
> His bark careering o'er unfathomed fields:
> Cold on his midnight watch the breezes blow
> From wastes that slumber in eternal snow,
> And waft across the waves' tumultuous roar
> *The wolf's long howl from Oonalaska's shore.*"
> —CAMPBELL, "*Pleasures of Hope.*"

The wetness of Alaska produces not only fat forests, but a great river system. The Yukon stream, which we rarely notice, has more water in it than the Mississippi. It is not so long as the Mississippi and the Missouri taken together, and yet it is 2,000 miles long, and is navigable for 1,500 miles from its mouth. In portions of its lower course it is so wide that one of its banks cannot be seen from the other. It freezes in October and opens in May.

The warm Pacific Current, striking against the half-arctic shore, produces abundant fogs and rains. The Alaskan climate is that of Northern Scotland—very wet, sometimes frosty; but, on the whole, not such as to clasp the forest in any deadly embrace nor to destroy the pasturage. I am not recommending Alaska, however, as an agricultural region. The money obtained in the seal-fur trade among the islands along the Alaskan coast is more in amount than the interest on the sum we paid for Alaska. A shallow sea skirts the Aleutian Archipelago, and there are in it fishing-banks more extensive and likely to be more profitable than those of Newfoundland. The timber is an important source of supply to shipbuilders over half the world. Go to Sydney and Melbourne; go to the ports of South America; go to San Francisco; go to the West Indies, and to some of the British provinces in the East Indies, and you will find ship-timber marked as coming from Alaska. There are important mines of coal and copper in this gnarled, dripping land. The forests, the fisheries, and the mines have already attracted to Alaska a hardy population. The fur trade is a copious source of wealth. It is more than possible that the fisheries may be as important as those of our eastern coast have been as a nursery for the American marine.

What is the moral condition of Alaska? Its religious wants were not neglected by Russia. How have they been met by the United States? The Russian Greek Church had a chapel, several schools, a seminary, seven missionary districts, eleven priests, and sixteen deacons in Alaska. The American Church finds it hard to raise the pittance needed to maintain two or three teachers there at this hour. Not long ago out of a school managed by an American lady in Alaska a white man captured a girl, and, when the mother of the girl exhibited her willing-

ness to sell her for twenty blankets, the teacher interfered; but the parents insisted on removing the pupil from school, and dragged her down to the river and told her she must take her place in the canoe. The girl drew back and said: "You may kill me. I shall not leave my teacher." And yet *you* leave that teacher in want of food and shelter, and thus leave hundreds of these pupils (they number nearly hundreds now) to be drawn back into paganism, and drawn down from paganism into something more horrible. The Russian Fur Company sent 6,000 dollars a year to support Christian missions in Alaska; and there were other sources of income there, such that 10,000 dollars a year came from Russia and the Greek Church into this territory for educational and religious enterprises. After Russia left the territory, the benevolent schemes of the Greek Church came into our hands as a sacred trust. General Howard, sent by our Government to investigate the religious condition of the territory, made a powerful appeal to the nation to send teachers and missionaries to Alaska. Roman Catholics have endeavoured to take possession of the territory. I believe, however, that, all told, there is not more than the sum of 3,000 dollars in all going to Alaska now to promote the religious interests of the territory. We are three times more penurious towards Alaska than Russia was under the Greek Church.* I read of a chief forty-five years old coming from the interior, the other day, to school, and saying: "Teach me the English language, that I may read the Bible. You teach these tribes nearer the coast; but my people in the interior are dark, dark, and in a little time they will all die, and they will go down down, dark." And the strong savage burst into tears, asking only for a little light to lead his tribe out of witchcraft, sorcery, the burning of widows, the maiming of the aged, the killing of decrepit parents, and all the barbarisms, down to cannibalism, that belong yet to some of the descendants of the Eskimo and Indian tribes in Alaska. The worst tribe in the territory is made up of unprincipled white men among the miners. There are about 70,000 Indians in Alaska, and about 30,000 whites and half-breeds. We are not increasing the numbers of the schools; but we are of the population and of the half-breeds.

Charles Sumner's ghost stands on the Pacific Coast, and from under the shadow of Mount St. Elias points out to us that in Alaska we have the key of the Northern Pacific. Seward's spirit hovers along the Aleutian Islands, looking upon us through the smoke of the ten volcanoes that there belch their fire and ashes toward the sky. John Eliot, through the clear northern azure, spreads his hands above the men of the Yukon. When I turn that way, I see behind these historic spirits the angel that appeared to one of old, and said: "Come over into Macedonia and help us."

The Lecture.

Magna Charta and the Declaration of Independence came from working-men's societies, organized for self-help; that is, from the guilds of the cities of Northern Italy and of the Hanseatic League. The pierced right hand of the Founder of Christianity drew the crusades to the East. The ports of Venice and of Genoa were filled with clamorous multitudes, who brought wealth to the merchants

* See documents by the Rev. Sheldon Jackson, D.D., missionary in Alaska and editor of the *Rocky Mountain Presbyterian*, Denver, Colorado.

and the working-people of these towns. The real cause of the commercial supremacy of Venice was in her municipal self-rule, and the cause of that self-rule was in her guilds and in the vigour which increasing wealth gave to her merchants and citizens through self-help; and the increasing wealth came from the crusades, and the crusades from the attraction of the Holy Sepulchre. In the crusades the pierced right hand of Christ put the ballot into the palm of the modern ages. Of course, the contest was a long one. Municipal freedom began the career of democracy in the modern world, and municipal freedom itself began in the guilds of working-men. The Hanseatic League and the cities of Northern Italy bought privileges from aristocrats. Little by little the guilds became strong enough to hold their heads aloft in cities, even while kings threatened and aristocrats moved as surly, sweeping storms above the homes of the middle classes and the poor. At last King John had Magna Charta wrenched from him—partly by aristocrats, I grant; and yet there never would have been power in the aristocracy of England to have obtained Magna Charta but for the strength of municipal freedom, itself depending on the strength of working-men's guilds.

You think that the obscure organizations which I am to discuss this morning are not important signs of the times: but when I look back to Venice and Genoa and the cities of Holland, I take instruction from history, and come to the conclusion that there is nothing much more significant than the brooding of the spirit of Christianity upon the masses, and their inspiration to self-help, industrially, socially, and politically. As in the past, working-men's organizations for self-help have, under the power of Christianity, changed the course of history, so in the future it may be that the organization of self-help among the masses is to give a new colouring, if not a new shape, to the industrial world.

Here I am, let us suppose, with nothing but my hands and head and health with which to support a family. It may be I am an operative. Perhaps I am a small trader. I wish to borrow money enough to build a house, or to enlarge my stock in trade. I go to the banks, and say that I will give my note for 500 dollars; but the banks tell me that, although I may be an honest man and a skilful workman, still it is very uncertain whether my skill will be employed, or whether I shall have steady business, if I am a small trader. Thus I find that I cannot give security for a loan, and I am crippled. If I could borrow a little money, I could start in trade in such a way as to turn my stock, and perhaps in a year or two have an independent business. Without the necessary capital, I am weak; and especially so in competition with great firms, that count their capital

by millions. I am an operative, and should be very glad to build a house and own it; but, as I have no capital except my physical powers, and cannot give any security except the prospect that I shall get work, when I stand alone, nobody will trust me, even if I have a good reputation and even if my health continues. Here are corporations with millions behind them running factories, and I am but one man. If I start a private business of my own, instantly some gigantic competition comes into collision with it. Sometimes these great corporations have to suspend business; and even if I am employed by a corporation I may yet be thrown out of work. So, while I stand here a small trader, or a respectable operative, and stand alone, I cannot borrow much. I have labour; but I have neither capital nor credit.

There are three great commercial powers in the world—labour, capital, credit. The working-man has the first of these. How can he get the others? This is the most important question in modern industrial discussions.

I go to my neighbours and say: "What if we become jointly and severally responsible for the money either of us wants to borrow. Cannot we do something? We are all small traders. What if we and several operatives and mechanics unite and make ourselves responsible in a body for the money that we may individually need. Such an arrangement would help us to credit. Perhaps we could get a hearing with the banks and capitalists, and be able to start our small enterprises, and maintain them occasionally in competition with these gigantic schemes that are our rivals."

Well, but my neighbours have their heads in their household affairs. It is hard to get a hearing on a new scheme, and I am but a working-man. Nobody thinks I am wise. It is hard to get attention; and when you have obtained the attention of the public, as Gladstone says, you have only lifted a drowsy man out of sleep. He is perpetually dropping back upon his pillow. It is a very hard thing to get attention when you have all the public facilities; but when you are only a working-man, an operative, how are you to bring your schemes before the public and secure any large success of co-operation?

In spite of discouragement, however, I, as an operative, keep on thinking concerning this matter. I read about it. At last I ascertain, what I ought to have known at first, that there are now in Germany nearly thirty years of experience behind co-operative societies of the very sort I wish to found. The attention of the most learned nation on the globe has been caught, has been held, and the attention of its government has been held, the attention of

capital has been held, to this very theme of co-operative savings-banks ever since 1850. This intelligence is a God-send to me, and I dwell upon it in detail.

1. Schulze Delitzsch's credit banks were begun in 1850. In 1870, according to official reports, they did a business of more than 300,000,000 dollars. The number of co-operating working-men connected with these associations in Germany is more than a million.

2. The fundamental principle of these German co-operative savings and loan associations is that it is unworthy of a man to ask help as long as he has power to help himself, and that the labourers who desire capital and credit can obtain them by co-operation or self-help better than by state-help.

Let the sand-lots listen! Let socialistic mercenaries, with joints in extra numbers in every limb; let philanthropic paupers, who would have the state lift the masses into all their business enterprises and sustain them there, attend to the voice of experience as uttered by no dreamer, but by Schulze Delitzsch, a deadly opponent of Lassalle, the agitator, who always insisted on state-help and nothing else.

3. Joint and several responsibility of the associated working-men is the basis on which credit is asked. The German co-operative banks founded by Schulze Delitzsch are organized on the principle of unlimited responsibility of the co-operators for the debts of the society to which they belong. All are for each and each is for all.

My college class had for its motto *Ekasto summakoi pantes*—"All the allies of each," and I do not know but we obtained it from these German co-operative banks.

4. Every member must give proof before his admission that he is solvent.

5. Each member must become a shareholder.

6. A share is a sum easily within the reach of economical working-men. Sometimes a share is only 200 dollars.

7. It may be paid by instalments.

8. No dividend can be drawn on it until it is paid in full.

9. Profits due on partly-paid shares are added to the portion paid until the share is matured; that is, paid in full.

10. Only members of the society can participate in its profits; and so in proportion to the chance of gain is the risk of loss.

11. The number of members is unlimited. Entrance and exit occur under easily fulfilled conditions.

If there were an exclusive arrangement for the entrance to these savings and loan associations, they would become aristocratic in a short time; but the doors stand open, and the German law compels

them to continue open. Whoever can meet these easy conditions is admitted. There is no tyranny in the regulations concerning exit, and nothing aristocratic in those concerning admission.

12. A reserve fund is formed from entrance fees and a percentage of the net profits.

13. Liability for deficits falls first on the reserve fund, then on the paid capital of the society, and lastly on the private property of the members.

14. The People's Bank is an association of persons, and not merely an association of capital, and so differs from a joint-stock society.

What is the difference between a joint-stock company and one of the co-operative banks? Why, in a joint-stock company only the capital put in is responsible for any losses that may occur in the course of business; but in one of these co-operative banks not only is the capital put in responsible, not only is the reserve fund made up from the entrance fees of members responsible, but the private property of the members is responsible also. Suppose that a society for co-operative credit wants to borrow money. Do you think the banks will give it any attention? Will the society be able to offer security? One of the associated working-men taken alone is worth no more as security than I was when I started in my discussion of this theme; but all of them taken together with their small properties used in one solid mass as security, are able to obtain credit.

Well, you say, what if they are able? What is the importance of that fact in the world? How is it that in modern discussion of philanthropic enterprises such emphasis is laid on this ability of average working-men to get large credit? Why, if they can obtain funds by the use of societies of credit, how do you know but they may have the ability by-and-bye to manage societies of production? Co-operative societies of credit lie at the basis of co-operative societies of consumption, and these at the basis of co-operative societies of production, and God knows what reform might not stand on the pedestal of these three blocks of granite, if only we can make the foundation-stone firm!

15. Thus associated, working-men can borrow money of the capitalists. *The solidarity of the co-operators makes each one of them worthy of credit.*

16. The share capital is supplemented by loans contracted in the open market.

In Germany the people's co-operative banks are able to go into the open market and borrow money in large loans, as well as any other banks. The historic certainty is that there is no other class of banks

in Germany that does as much business to day as these co-operative savings and loan associations among working-men. Schulze Delitzsch is dead and gone. He was only a superior officer of the town of Delilasch, a place of not more than 6,000 inhabitants, and was once in the Prussian Parliament; and yet his philosophy is per meating Germany at this hour and is the watchword of the sober working class.

17. There is still further augmentation of share capital in these banks by savings deposits.

Thus far I have discussed the people's banks of Germany only as credit associations; but I must now emphasize the fact that they take the place of the average savings-banks. And just here I may as well break out of my line of propositions, and ask whether the present is not a good time to discuss these safe savings-banks, when so much public distrust has been sown through this commonwealth in regard to our American savings-banks that the diminution in the deposits in Massachusetts savings-banks alone during the last year was greater than the whole amount of deposits in these savings-banks twenty years ago. I am not attacking our savings-banks; but the managers of some of them have deserved distrust. If there were a gibbet here and one or two of the savings-bank directors present who have cheated orphans and widows, one would like to choke the thieves, until they are frightened, at least. If there is any infamy in the list of defalcations blacker than another, it is the breach of trust in the care of the funds the poor widow has gathered from her work at midnight with the needle; the funds the poor shop-girl has gathered in making shirts, twelve of them for thirty-six cents; the funds the poor shop-boy has gathered by starving himself, when he was not paid enough to cover the cost of his board. Your savings-bank receives these deposits; and then some light-fingered officer hears of a good chance to invest the funds, contrary to the rules of the bank. He is convinced that his motives are good—his judgment may be poor indeed, but he is so sure that he has an honest heart and is so inclined to trust the chances of trade—we must risk something or we shall never gain anything—that he takes these savings, put into his hands for sacred keeping, and invests them, not for the purpose of multiplying the funds of the widow or of the orphan, but for that of taking a large commission privately and stuffing it into his own purse. The result sometimes is that the bank has to suspend, in order that a few of these emissaries of Gehenna may try their experiments on Wall Street and State Street. It is a fearful sign of the times when the poor distrust the savings-banks. If the distrust goes much further, the time will come—I know it is altogether against the fashion to

speak of these things—a day will arrive when rich men cannot put their money into savings-banks and hide it under false pretences, and so get it out of the taxable lists. It is utter heresy to refer to these matters; and yet, as I have no interest in any savings-bank, or any other bank in particular, I shall be allowed to affirm that the co-operative savings-banks, begun by the working-men of Germany, are worthy of imitation even in Massachusetts, and in competition with your best managed American banks. That statesman, Mr. Quincy, who sat on this platform last Monday, is now engaged not only in opening a co-operative store in Massachusetts, but also in founding co-operative savings and loan societies on the German plan.

18. The deposits in the co-operative savings-banks are not to be withdrawn without due notice.

19. Funds are lent to members only.

20. These regulations make it possible for working-men to borrow money enough to conduct building societies and other co-operative enterprises. They make possible the success of co-operative manufactures and productions of all kinds.

I hold in my hand an official copy of a German law, signed by the Emperor William and Bismarck; and in it are all the details of legislation on which these co-operative banks are founded. I have here a brief extract from Schulze Delitzsch, with which I must trouble you, because it is a summary of the principles of these renowned institutions, now representing the industrial interests of a million and a half of working-men :—

"In our associations the principle of self-assistance in relation to the necessity for ready money in trade and social economy, for those who either cannot command at all, or only under onerous conditions, the ordinary banking facilities, is so brought into operation that—

"1. The loan-seekers are themselves supporters and managers of the institutions established for the satisfaction of their credit necessities—that is, members of the Advance Association; and, thereby, risk and profit of the business are to them common.

"2. That the money transactions, enabled by means of the association, are everywhere arranged on a business footing (lending and borrowing); so that bank interest, according to the state of the money market, is assured to the creditors from the society treasury, as well as to the latter from the borrower. Similarly, a proportionate remuneration to officials, such as treasurers, for their official labours.

"3. That either by paying in the full sum at once, or very gradually by continual little assessments upon the members, 'business shares' are formed in the society treasury, in accordance with the respective amounts of which the business profits are divided and allotted to them, until reaching the sum originally determined upon, whereby, as by

stock, one obtains a continually increasing special capital for the society business.

"4. That, besides, through admission fees of members and division of profits, a general fund of the society is collected as a reserve, which especially serves to cover losses.

"5. That the foreign or outside capital which may be in addition requisite for the full business working of the society is obtained by borrowing upon common credit, and under the *responsibility in solido of all the members.*

"6. That, in conclusion, the number of members is unlimited, and admission stands open to all who can fulfil the general conditions of the constitution; likewise the exit from the society, the latter under the condition of a certain time of notice given.

"It will be at once understood that in regard to the question of by far the greatest importance—viz., the obtaining a sufficient business fund for our people's banks—the aforesaid prescribed measures Nos. 3 and 5 must go hand in hand." *

The Rochdale co-operative stores, the German co-operative banks, the multitudes of benefit societies among working-men, are not a scheme; they are a growth. I believe in historic results that are not planned of man; but brought about by the operation of great natural forces. The British constitution is such a result. Co-operative credit banks are not so much a plan of man as a natural growth from the deep new soil of the industrial world, under the sunlight of Christianity.

Go to France, where everything is or was done on paper. Go to France, where Louis XIV. said: "*L'Etat, c'est moi!*" Contrast co-operation in France under state-help with co-operation in Germany under self-help. Lassalle's doctrine, in contradistinction to that of Schulze Delitzsch, has been brought into activity in France, from which, indeed, he learned it. He was accustomed to say that the state is made up of ninety-six working-men and four capitalists, and that the four capitalists ought to enable the ninety-six working-men to start their enterprises, and, therefore, should give them credit. It was Lassalle's doctrine that every co-operative institution formed by working-men should be nursed by the state and given money enough to compete with its rivals. What has been the history of that doctrine? Self-help! I have exhibited its career in Germany. State-help! Here are the propositions that summarize its career in French industrial history:

1. Co-operation becomes a species of communism when the state supplies capital to co-operative societies.

* On the German People's Banks, see an admirable article in Meyer's "Deutsches Jahr Buch," 1872, pp. 704-715.

2. In February, 1848, the French Government organized a large number of national workshops, and voted 3,000,000 francs for their use.

3. Three-fourths of the societies perished, after a brief period.

Why did they perish? Because the working-men had no stimulation comparable with that under the other system. They had less stimulation to industry, they had less to honesty and to foresight; and without honesty and foresight these institutions all went to wreck. Where are the orators of Communism and Socialism who clamour for the opening of public workshops, in order to give the poor labour? Where are the men who think that state-help should stand behind all co-operative enterprises of the poor? Let them look at the wrecked French governmental workshops, killed by state-help; and the German co-operative banks, successful through self-help.

4. The progress of Socialism and Communism was aided by every application of state-help to co-operate societies.

5. The state lost its money and did not benefit the working-men.

6. Only a remnant of the societies, which substantially rejected state-help and depended on self-help, survived.

7. There are now at least forty examples of successful societies of co-operative production in Paris alone; but they depend on self-help.

8. Industrial partnerships based on self-help are increasingly successful in France.

How do industrial partnerships differ from working-men's co-operative societies? The former give the working-man a certain percentage of the profits of the business in which he labours. Bonamy Price says that England does not believe in industrial partnerships, because employers cannot promise to pay working-men a portion of the profits unless the labourers will be responsible for any possible loss. This they cannot be, and so England does not believe in industrial partnerships. That argument is used in the United States against such partnerships. But what if by co-operative savings-banks and loan associations working-men should at last become able to say to their employers: "We will bear our part of the losses in the business in which we labour, if you will give us an industrial partnership with capital in the profits, and a certain percentage agreed on by arbitration." Then, possibly, they would obtain a hearing. Thus, at the bottom of all industrial partnerships, at the basis of all co-operative production or co-operative societies for sale of the most necessary articles of consumption, lies co-operative credit.

As a friend of both rich and poor, I plant my feet upon the corner

stone of the institutions of Schulze Delitzsch, or co-operation through self-help among working-men. And may God bless this foundation of an edifice not yet built, but of which every stone may be laid in harmony with the plan shown us on the Mount! Not state-help, not forced loans, not irredeemable currency as a source of credit, not political land, not the abolition of inheritance; but the spirit of Christianity laying the foundation-stone of self-help and building upon it industry, honesty, foresight, among the masses, until co-operative credit and co-operative production and industrial partnerships become possible and common—this is a slowly rising temple of which the completion would be the joy of the whole earth! The spirit of Christianity will preside over this structure, until the summit of the temple will rise as a worshipping spire or tower towards God, with a bell in it which may some day speak loud enough to drown and hush the voices not only of fleecers of the poor and of any tyrants among capitalists, but also of foul mouthed and shallow declaimers for Socialism and Communism.

DEATH-TRAPS AND FEVER-DENS IN CITY SLUMS

Prelude.—The Custom-House Changes.

The great gates of the ocean at New York, on which no hands but those of the nation should ever be laid, have been swung to and fro by merely partisan politicians, until their creaking has aroused Executive remonstrance from Washington. Sixty-five per cent. of the imports and fifty of the exports of the whole country pass through the New York Harbour. The New York custom-house collects two-thirds of the whole customs revenue of the nation. Here is a chance for spoils. Not a little oiling has been applied to these commercial gates by henchmen who clamour for harmony, lest the New York State vote be lost in some closely-contested presidential election. In spite of these oleaginous thieves, the truth at last is told concerning the New York custom-house by a President who, in this attack on the abuses of the civil service, is supported not by his own party exclusively, but by the best men of all political parties in the United States. It is evident that not New York State only, and not only the circle of towns that have their trade centring at the mouth of the Hudson, but the whole country is interested in having this giant custom-house managed on business principles. What has the President told us? His official language is very grave and is likely to be remembered in history. It is the fact, the President affirms, that the men appointed to manage this custom-house have "regarded the duties of the offices held by them as subordinate in importance to their partisan work" as leaders of a political party in New York City and State. The President assures the Senate that they have made the custom-house "a centre of political management." Everybody knows that this is the truth, and that it is important truth, and that it requires courage to proclaim it in a presidential message. An Executive order, sustained by the Senate, has been issued changing the New York custom-house from a head-quarters of partisan political enterprises into a place of business for the commerce of the nation.

Goldwin Smith has affirmed that under party government a nation very rarely hears the truth on politics, except from men who have no aspiration for high office. The leaders of our political parties are all of them aspirants for high office, and it is only now and then, when a politician who is a leader happens to be also a statesman, that we obtain from him the undistorted truth. The platform, the pulpit, and the independent press are to be looked to for frank discussion of the highest moral issues of public affairs, where partisan interests and personal selfishness warp the opinions and especially the public expressions of partisan leaders.

Our political system is so arranged that a local evil may easily have a national effect. An election in one state may decide a presidential contest; and so what are supposed to be general interests may require silence as to some local evil. It may be that only one pebble is in the shoe of the nation; and yet the weight of the whole body politic is sometimes thrown on the shoe containing that single pebble, and on that part of the shoe in which the pebble lies! On the California coast there is a pebble which we call the Chinese question; and just now the gigantic forms of the Democratic and the Republican parties rise on tip-toe and stand on that pebble. The pain that results shoots through every limb of the body politic. It is feared a closely contested presidential election in 1880 may turn on the Chinese question

in California; and so all we in the East, as we in the Mississippi Valley, must bow down to sand-lot oratory. The floor of the Senate itself is at this hour transformed into something very like a sand-lot.

We are likely to see such results over and over whenever one state can determine a presidential election. The size and fatness of the national spoils at stake are the main issue. The Chinese question is not the only illustration of the crescent danger from this source. The custom-house of New York is another. What if a New York senator makes unconstitutional pretensions to control executive appointments in New York? Harmony between a great New York senator and the Executive must be maintained! Hush up the sins of the custom-house and save the party! These are the cries of the henchmen at New York and in Albany. We must have the vote of New York in 1880, otherwise the Republican party cannot succeed. Whether honesty or dishonesty, let us keep schism out of our own camp. It is a marvel, with spoils larger than Cæsar or Anthony or Lepidus ever clutched at, standing at the disposal of our Democratic and Republican parties, that there is as much honesty in them as there is. While the spoils system is followed, 100,000 men are to be put out of office or into it every time the parties change that control the Government.

Spoils spoil politics in this country, and will continue to do so until we spoil the spoils. The best blow of late in spoiling the spoils has been the Presidential message attacking the New York custom-house as a partisan establishment in the President's own party. I honour men for courage on the battle-field, and also for courage in the halls of congressional and general public debate. Surely it required courage in the leader of the dominant party in the United States to act against the majority of his own party and to smite this great cancer with a resolute plunge of a deep reforming blade, as he has done. Although you may blame President Hayes for various things; although you may not be of his party; you must recollect that he is attacking an evil rooted in the Senate itself; rooted at the very core of our politics; rooted in the great cities especially, and having its tap-root in the municipality at the mouth of the Hudson, where commerce has for years winked at the evils of politics in this very custom-house. I think it a marvel that, by the aid of votes from both parties, this President has been enabled to get his nominations confirmed. It is a marvel because the evil is so deep-seated and is so connected with the growth of the country. The victory has a cheerful significance for the future. The white gulls that sail above the waters at the mouth of the Hudson will look down in two hundred years on a commerce there greater than that of London. They will look down probably on as large a proportion of the imports and exports of the country as they do now. As our population is doubling every thirty or forty years, we shall soon have two-thirds of the imports and half the exports of the wealthiest of nations passing through that one harbour.

We have some ludicrous incidents to notice in connection with the purification of the New York custom-house. There is a brave body of men in the legislature of New York who lately elected a senator with the understanding that he carried the New York custom-house in his pocket. He appears to have carried a majority of the New York legislature there. When the President's preparation to oppose the New York senator had grown portentous, and when it seemed likely to be successful, about forty-seven of the brave men in the legislature of New York sent a petition asking the senators as a body to confirm the nominations of the President, and then privately wrote to the New York senator they were very sorry for what they had done, that they had been wheedled into the gift of their signatures, and that they hoped all would be forgiven and forgotten.

If these things occur in a green tree, what will occur in a dry? It is startling

enough to find cipher dispatches humiliating the nation; it is startling to find our management of a great custom-house humiliating the nation; it is startling to find our Senate smiting a peaceful power like China in the face, without any provocation. If we would understand these phenomena, we must go behind them and study the enormous size of the spoils that tempt partisan politics in this country, and we shall see clearly that the only way to diminish the temptations to greed and fraud is to reform the civil service, so as to diminish the size of the spoils.

There has been nothing more resonant and hopeful in politics of late than the letter I hold in my hand from the Executive Mansion to the present chief officer of the Custom-house at New York:—

"Executive Mansion, Washington, Feb 4th, 1879.

"My Dear General,—I congratulate you on your confirmation. It is a great gratification to me, very honourable to you, and will prove, I believe, o signal service to the country. My desire is that the office be conducted on strictly business principles, and according to the rules for the civil service which wer recommended by the Civil Service Commission in the administration of Genera Grant. I want you to be perfectly independent of mere influence from any quarter. Neither my recommendation, nor that of Secretary Sherman, nor of any member of Congress, or other influential person must be specially regarded. Let appointments and removals be made on business principles and according to rule. There must, I assume, be a few confidential places filled by those you personally know to be trustworthy; but restrict the area of patronage to the narrowest limits. Let no man be put out merely because he is a friend to Mr. Arthur, and no man put in merely because he is our friend. The good of the service should be the sole end in view. The best means yet presented, it seems to me, are the rules recommended by the Civil Service Commission. I shall issue no new order on the subject at present. I am glad you approve of the message, and I wish you to see that all that is expressed or implied in it is faithfully carried out.

"Again congratulating you and assuring you of my entire confidence, I remain sincerely,

"To General E. A. Merritt." "R. B. Hayes.

This letter is a deed, and not merely a promise. It has in it the ring of the best American political platforms. Perhaps in one of its sentences may be found the explanation of certain appointments made by President Hayes, and criticized by the country, as based on favouritism. He says that he assumes that a few places must be filled by trustworthy persons, known to the appointing power. For one, I believe that most of the appointments that have been criticized could be explained by the necessity of having a few places filled by persons known to the President as trustworthy. I beg you to notice that such appointments are a part of the President's creed. He makes no pretence that he does not sometimes appoint persons near to him and that he can trust; but his purpose is to restrict the use of patronage to the narrowest limits.

It was my fortune a few weeks ago to pass through most of the departments at Washington, and to put questions to several leading officials on the prospects of civil service reform. The secret opinion appeared to be that civil service reform is not likely to succeed in this country until some party comes into power that will abuse the patronage very largely. Under such a dangerous trial of our government as a large abuse of the appointing power cannot fail to bring upon us, there will be created a party, Democratic or Republican, or composed of the best elements of both, and which will succeed on the cry of civil service reform. The spoils of the wealthiest of nations are the loadstone in the mountain, making every magnetic needle on the political ship deviate from the pole. Until after the success of some party that uses patronage corruptly we never shall reform the civil service.

That is the whisper in the Washington atmosphere. I believe, however, that the opinion of the country on the topic is slowly growing more hopeful. If in the few months remaining in the present Executive's term of office he will adhere to the resonantly righteous doctrines of his letter, it will be impossible to nominate anybody with success in 1880 without a pledge from the candidate that he will see to it that the civil service is purified.

The Lecture.

Until personal visitation of death-traps and fever dens in city slums shall dig an Æolus Cave, in which hurricanes may be produced to smite our sluggard public legislation as to the homes of the poor, I have little hope that the ear of the United States can be caught by discussion of the diseases that spring up in the squalid quarters of great towns. Our land is too large, our population too sparse to make even a Russian plague terrible as yet. We can flee to the mountains; we can flee to the quiet, lonely seashores. I cannot impress even this audience on our compact seaboard with any conception of the enormity of the evil I am about to attack unless you are accustomed to personal visitation of the slums in August. We are out of the city, most of us, in that month; but when I take up the legal documents of this Commonwealth, and turn to the report of the board of health of Boston, I find that the number of complaints made as to nuisances in this city in the heated season are so numerous that the board of health cannot attend to them adequately. Official language before me says: "In warm weather the complaints made at the office are so numerous as to prevent anything like a systematic inspection of the yards and alleys, the officers being engaged their whole time in investigating the causes, often very complicated, of nuisances reported by citizens." * I hold up that ghastly official confession by the Boston board of health as a not insignificant sign of the times.

Although a fifth of our population live in cities, there is need here of the wisdom forced by necessity on more crowded populations. Bring here George Peabody's spirit; bring here that Prince Consort whom Tennyson praises for studying model-lodging houses and all the details of homes for working men in England.

> "Laborious for her people and her poor—
> Voice in the rich dawn of an ampler day—
> Far-sighted summoner of War and Waste
> To fruitful strifes and rivalries of peace."

The poet eulogizes this Prince for nothing so much as for his

* "City Document," No. 67, for 1877, p. 9.

attention to humble, industrial, and sanitary details, which we think are unworthy of the lavender touches of fashion and which even Christianity is at times unwilling to face. Bring here Mayor Waterlow, of London; bring here Lady Burdett Coutts; bring here the noble women without name who have filled the most desolate wards of London with enterprises managed by an Octavia Hill and Florence Nightingale.

There are in London aristocratic men and women by scores who find it entirely consonant with their dignity to go into the slums and attend to models for lodging-houses and to the purification of quarters made desolate by unnecessary filth.

In New York City at this moment there is an open hall in which about one hundred and eighty models for working-men's dwelling-houses are on exhibition; but, if you stand there and watch the people who come in, you will find that we have not yet reached the proper intensity of sentiment on this theme. It is true the ministry is well represented among the visitors who are there to inspect those models; it is true some of the most intelligent editors are there; it is true that some scheming capitalists are there, who have heard that model lodging-houses for the poor pay a high per cent. of profit in London; it is true a few philanthropists are there, a few women, a few scholars, a few literary men. But, although the interest in the examination of those models in New York has surprized that city, it is a small ripple. It is a thin rill running through a dead sea of public indifference. Where complaints are so numerous in hot weather that the board of health cannot attend to them in Boston—perhaps as well managed a city of its size as there is on this continent or any other—we must see that the little attention the public has given to the topic of death-traps and fever-dens in city slums is only the sprinkling of a few disinfectants on an open sewer.

It is the first difficulty of my theme that you do not personally visit the poor. The way to awaken public sentiment on temperance is to promote the Christian plan of visiting the degraded. The way to secure right public sentiment as to the homes of working-men is to promote personal visitation of those homes. Here are our political fleets lying becalmed, their sails flapping against the masts, and the seas so silent under them that the very seams of the vessels separate, and drop their oakum, and suck destruction. You want a hurricane to fill the public air on the topic of temperance and on the topic of working-men's homes! How are you to hollow out your Æolus Cave, in which this hurricane can be nursed, except from personal visitation from house to house in the slums, and by witnessing the squalor that lies not far from the

windows of the fashionable quarters of many of our cities? In New York, not long ago, some delicate women thought that they would visit the worst quarters of that city; and several of them were made sick by the first contact with odours more villainous than those which assailed Falstaff's nostrils when he was covered up in the basket. I have read of maidens of Fifth Avenue who thought it a noble thing to go and visit the poor, and some of them were smitten down by fevers; and yet their visits were made in mid-winter. It is not safe to visit these fever-traps and rookeries in July. You must go fortified by a good meal, a good night's sleep, a good conscience, and absence of anxiety.

Put yourself in the most desolate room you ever saw and stay there a night. Give a week with the poorest of the poor, instead of visiting them spasmodic fashion. If little glimpses of their position and thin snatches of their experience overpower you, what would be the effect of living constantly where they do? Go and stay at least one day in the poisoning attic and in the dark cellar. Sleep on the straw that is separated but by a single board from the pestilent open cellar-drains. Put yourself, where I have been sometimes—I wish I had more time to visit such quarters—in attics where, placing your hand on your head, the upper part of the palm touches the ceiling, and where, under the roof, still lower, there is a bed, with nothing on it, except a mattress of straw, a blanket, and one or two indescribably filthy, ragged, coverlids. Five persons—a father and mother and three children—plunge themselves into that straw at night, cover themselves in January and February with those rags, and bless God for the cold, for it seals the poisonous sewer under the house. It seals other poisons of the yards and alleys; and the poor are glad when the frosts come, and are glad for good reasons. But go there in a July night; sweat under that roof; lie there with the stable of some livery-keeper sending up its fumes under your windows. You open them for fresh air, and you admit the worst poisons of the cesspool exhalations. Your children are born there. You must stay there; they must stay there. They are brought up on the flag-stones, over which the most infamous men and women stagger to ruin. They look out from their cradles into brothels; they hear the worst of men and women curse each other. From their cradles your children grow worse, until the cherub of your baby is an imp at seven years of age and a full-grown imp at ten or twelve. And you stay in the slums yet, and bring up your children there; and they, even if they emigrate to another city, may fall into no better place. Sailors from the rough deep come into these quarters, with all their bad habits. Temptations which the city throws around the

seafaring class are thrown around your children as well. I know a scholar of most exquisite culture who battled for three or four years with the poisonous exhalations rising around his home in the North End. He went there to study the poor; he went there as a missionary to the slums; and he did study them at first hand. I have seen him twice and thrice prostrated, although he took the very best care of his health. He was prostrated by the fevers that came up into a house of which the most excellent care was taken. He could not escape from his environment, and at last, although possessed of bravery enough to make from his little finger half a dozen ordinary men, he was obliged to take his body off the ground, to avoid putting it under the ground.

Such are the death-traps which in a Puritan city are allowed to exist in numbers so large that the board of health cannot attend to them in detail in the summer. Your officers admit that, even when attention can be given to these evils, there is so much investigation needed that the nuisances cannot be removed at once. Red tape, even after the nuisance is discovered, encircles the heap of filth. Until all the requirements of all this slow-moving machinery are met, there cannot be relief even from a nuisance large enough to produce legal complaint. Here is the difficulty, and, as the only means of awakening public sentiment concerning it, I advise personal visitation of city slums.

Every great public evil should be discussed under two heads: the mischief and the remedy. There are three remedies for the overcrowding of the poor in the death-traps and rookeries of great towns.

1. Action by the city government.
2. Philanthropic intervention by capitalists.
3. Self-help by working-men through building societies and mutual savings and loan associations and the personal, ownership of moderately expensive houses by men of moderate means.

All these measures will in most large towns need to be combined, as a remedy of overcrowding; but I beg leave to insist upon each antidote in detail.

1. In 1873 the city of Glasgow, under the lead of the Lord Provost, Sir James Watson, voted to expend sixpence in the pound to improve the dwelling places of its working-classes. This was a tax of more than two cents on a dollar; but it proved to be wise economy. The Registrar general of England says that only seventeen in 1,000 of any population need die in any one year, if sanitary regulations are made what they should be. But in parts of old Glasgow, before the recent improvements, the death-rate stood at 70 in 1,000. People were

housed at the rate of one thousand to the acre. The municipal government, under a special act authorizing compulsory sale of bad dwellings, bought and proceeded to demolish some 7,000,000 dollars' worth of property in pestilent areas, in which commercial enterprise erected new and excellent habitations. Improvements are still in progress at Glasgow; but in 1874 3,085 houses had been demolished, displacing an estimated population of 15,000, to provide for which and for the natural growth of the city, 26,000 houses have been erected within the municipal boundaries. To this work Glasgow was incited by the discussions of the British Association for the Advancement of Social Science, which met in that city in 1860; and that Association itself had felt the incitement of George Peabody and of Prince Albert and of Sir Sydney Waterlow in the study of dwellings for the poor.

2. It is a tempting but not always easy method of reforming the gigantic mischief I am discussing to rely on philanthropy and on the benefactions of great capitalists.

It has been concluded in London that the poorest of the working-classes must have dwellings near their work, and that, therefore, model lodging-houses are to be encouraged in every way. In 1873 the Council of the Charity Organization of the city of London formed a committee of members of Parliament, and others, who met under the presidency of Sir Sydney Waterlow, then Lord Mayor, and held fifteen sittings, principally presided over by Lord Napier and Ettrick. They had the benefit of the counsel of most eminent practical men, some of whom had devoted their lives to the subject of the right management of crowded populations. They published a report, and two of their conclusions, containing truths on which George Peabody and Lady Burdett Coutts and Prince Albert had previously acted, were in these words.—

"*That the mass or the poorer classes must be provided with habitations near their work.*

"That the only agency which can carry on this great work, with due regard to the moral and physical welfare of the people, is municipal government, acting with enlarged powers and through the instrumentality of commercial enterprise, partly in its individual, but chiefly in its associated form."

In view of these facts * it is surprising that not long ago, at a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Social Science, some effort was made to decry model lodging-houses for the

* "Report for 1874 of the British Association for the Advancement of Social Science."

poorest of the poor in great cities, and to set up the cheap homes that may be erected near cities and low railway fares as a sufficient relief. *It is important to defend the proposition that both cheap homes around Boston and New York and model lodging-houses in the crowded part of these cities are needed and would be good property.* For a dwelling with a kitchen, parlour, one bed-room, and a recess for a second bed, 3 dollars 75 cents a week, or 175 dollars a year, must be paid in ordinary times in a city. Let the best paid working-men follow the better class of citizens into the country around Boston for dwellings. A house and a little land can be bought for 1,000 dollars. The interest on that sum is only 70 dollars a year. If the man who now pays 175 dollars rent a year will borrow, by the aid of his friends, 1,000 dollars, he may pay 70 dollars interest, and save at least 100 dollars a year, with which to purchase a home for himself and family in the country. *But, besides the cheap homes outside, model lodging-houses are needed inside a city.* Boston is now a crescent, extending around the tip of the tongue of Massachusetts Bay, from Chelsea Beach to the Milton hills. It is not safe to go upon the supposition that all the old peninsula will be needed as a commercial exchange, and that the poorest of the poor can be crowded out of it into houses beyond a ferry or reached only by a railway. The experience of all great cities is that the perishing poor must live near their work, and will not as a mass go beyond a ferry. They will not do this in Boston for at least fifty or a hundred years to come, and probably not then. If this city, therefore, is not to be behind Glasgow and London, she needs model lodging-houses in her crowded and pestilent quarters. Already the death-rate of Boston has risen to 27 in 1,000—higher than the present rate of Chicago, which has to reach out three miles into Lake Michigan for pure water and is built on a swamp. New York City has a death-rate of 30; but Philadelphia of only 21.

The Peabody lodging-houses in London pay on the average from five to seven per cent. on their cost. There is very little property in London of the same sort that pays as high an income as that. The Waterlow lodging-houses in London pay rather more than the Peabody; and yet are not very different from them. Many of you perhaps have passed through some specimen of each of these sets of buildings. I once examined the Peabody buildings in detail, and saw nothing abroad of American design of which I was more proud. The rooms in the Peabody model lodging-houses are about 12 by 11 feet in size and nine feet high. Each family has two of these, and one of the two is fitted up with a coal grate, which has attached to it a hot-water boiler on one side of the fire and an oven on the other.

The second chamber is fitted up as a bed-room. A large cupboard serves as a pantry. In the attic I found the drying-room, men's baths, women's baths, and the place where, under regulations pasted up in print on the walls, washing of linen was performed by different families on different days. Here were boilers, tanks, kettles, and a common wringing-machine. Lavatories for each flat occur near the common stairs. The buildings I visited were five stories high.

I was impressed by the neatness everywhere visible and by the good ventilation in the great halls. The Peabody lodging-houses are constructed on the idea that you cannot ventilate a great caravansary of a house unless you leave a wall open along the staircases; and so in the rear the staircases are entirely opened to the sky, and the children have a playground on the landings. There is a considerable space for ventilation in the rear of the buildings.

It has been the policy of Lady Burdett Coutts, and of Mayor Waterlow, and of George Peabody, to put their houses in the most squalid quarters. The Waterlow Houses are scattered through the worst slums in the city. Compared with the squalor around them, there was no more marked difference in the architecture of the houses than in the apparent moral condition of the inmates. Once clean, it is astonishing what self-respect comes to the tenant in the Peabody lodging-houses or the Waterlow mansion. It is mysterious that next to godliness is cleanliness, and that nothing physical so purifies the soul and lifts it into self-respect and an endeavour after righteousness as clean linen. Mr. Emerson says that he has heard a fine lady remark that she has had a satisfaction in a perfectly fitting wardrobe that Christianity never could give.

3. After all that city governments, philanthropy, and the selfish interests of capital can do to improve the sanitary condition of crowded dwellings of the poor in cities, the problem will never be solved except by self-help among working-men.

Lodging-houses like Peabody's and Waterlow's are good property. But the activities of capitalists in improving city property rented to the poor are subject to hindrances that will be slow of removal. The evil of overcrowding must become enormous before capitalists will move in this matter; and philanthropists, without capitalists behind them, are weak in attempting to cure the mischief. Let us, therefore, fasten our hope upon a new scheme; at least, largely new in this country and especially new in Massachusetts. In spite of the efforts of several of our philanthropists and most far-seeing public men, the nation is to-day comparatively ignorant concerning the methods by which working-men in Philadelphia have built one hundred thousand homes and paid for them. We are comparatively

ignorant as to the plans by which in Great Britain millions of property have been put into buildings owned by working-men of only small incomes. I have been insisting of late on self-help, in opposition to state-help, and for one, I know of nothing that sounds out more like the bugles of Lucknow afar, as a call to hope for the cause of labour, than the history in the last fifty years of the savings and loan associations which have been made the basis of ownership by working-men of their own homes.

How shall the working-man become his own landlord?

1. In some city ward or rural town, let us suppose, 1,000 men agree to save 1,000 dollars a month, until each has accumulated 200 dollars.

2. They form themselves into an association, and, instead of hoarding their small savings, pay one dollar a month into a common fund.

3. If the money thus collected is not put at interest, it is evident that 200 months will pass before each has saved 200 dollars.

4. But if the common fund be put at interest, each may save 200 dollars in less than 200 months.

5. At compound interest a sum of money doubles itself in about fourteen years.

6. Suppose that the society loans its money monthly and compounds the interest. It can reduce the number of months from 200 to about 144, and the payments from 200 dollars to 144 dollars.

Here is a rural town, and you cannot get money in it in large sums. Two or three hard-fisted men have money. But I am a poor labourer, and I cannot borrow a thousand dollars of Shylock, junior, and especially not of Shylock, senior. There is no capital here. Or, if I am in a city ward in an unfashionable quarter, there may be no rich man within reach. If working-men go to the bank as individuals to ask loans, they get no hearing. Twenty or thirty of us subscribe money enough to obtain from the state a charter, and to buy account-books for a savings and loan association. We receive from the state authority to found a society, with the right to issue 2,500 shares at 200 dollars each. Any one can buy a share who will pledge himself to pay a dollar a month until his share amounts to 200 dollars. We advertise shares as for sale on these conditions. A first meeting is held. It is largely attended out of curiosity, and we sell 1,000 shares. The shareholders have the management of the association.

At the very first meeting at which the shares are sold the first monthly instalment is paid in. There are 1,000 dollars on the table. What are we going to do with it? Capital has made its appearance

in our midst. Capital is here on this deal-board table in the rural town. Here are a thousand dollars, made up by contributions of a dollar each. Suppose that we loan this money, and thus, by interest, add to the original fund. It is evident we shall reduce the number of months required for the execution of our enterprise. But at the next monthly meeting 500 more shares are sold, and the second monthly instalment is paid in, and we have 1,500 dollars to loan.

To whom shall we loan the money? Who wants it? Why, we want it ourselves; and we will loan it only to our own members.

7. Let the society loan it to its own members only, and on proper security make advances of the whole amount a member would receive at the close of the society, and charge the borrower interest at the legal rates.

We will do business in a business style. We will ask interest here, although we lend to ourselves.

8. The increasing value of the shares held in our society will make the shares themselves, as time progresses, better and better security for the repayment of the money.

When we come together in the monthly meeting and look at the money on the table, we find that there are several persons who would like to bid for the privilege of borrowing it. Here a man wants to borrow 400 dollars, another 600 dollars: and it may be that at the fourth or fifth monthly meeting our capital has increased, until we have 6,000 dollars or 7,000 dollars to lend. New members have come in. We have sold three or four new sets of shares. There may be 10,000 dollars to lend. There will be a competition among borrowers. Very well. We will loan this money at six per cent.; but we will charge a premium according as men bid. Our interest on the money is one source of income; but it is perfectly fair, when several members wish to have the first advance, that we should cause an auction to be held, and so decide the right of priority to the use of the money that is to be loaned. We make an advance to the highest bidder.

9. This gives a new source of income, or that from premiums, and the premiums are placed at compound interest and draw new premiums.

10. The society may, therefore, be closed in perhaps 96 months, instead of 144, and by the payment of only 96 dollars a share may mature, that is, acquire a worth of 200 dollars.

Your 96 dollars become 200 dollars in 96 months, under this scheme. Can you lend your small sums of money out in any other way so safely and profitably? You begin to see that there is business strategy in this plan of mutual savings and loans.

11. As the sums of money in possession of our treasury are not very large, there is no great danger of defalcation. The treasurer of such a society would barely have more than 4,000 dollars or 6,000 dollars in his hands at one time, and he is to give adequate bonds to cover the risk.

The law in Pennsylvania limits the amount of the money that one of these societies may issue. The law in Massachusetts, passed under the incitement of Mr. Quincy, limits the amount that may be issued in shares in such a society; and so the danger of defalcation is diminished. The treasurer, of course, has to give adequate bonds to cover the risk.

12. If some members must retire, let them do so on receiving a profit of six per cent. on their capital.

13. The amount their capital has earned above six per cent. belongs to the society, and so increases its income.

14. If members fail to make their monthly payments, let there be a small fine for the first offence and a heavy one for the second. These fines increase the funds of the society.

15. Real estate, after approval by the directors of the bank as security, may be taken as guaranteeing the repayment of loans; but no single piece of real estate is to be taken as a guarantee for two loans.

16. Every shareholder should have a vote in electing officers.

The law in Pennsylvania permits every shareholder to cast as many votes as he has shares; but the practice of most of these associations in Philadelphia is to give every shareholder only one vote. They have a feeling that a man does not always grow wiser as he grows richer; and so a man with five shares should not have five votes. Their purpose is thus to avoid misrule, by allowing one vote to each member, and only one.

17. Such an association may be changed from a terminating into a permanent society, by renewal on the maturing of its shares.

18. Our society has authority to sell 2,500 shares, which are worth, when mature, 200 dollars each. We do not sell them all at once, but in series. When our first set of shares is sold, it is like a ring on a rod. After the sale of a second series, we have a second ring. This pushes on the first; and then a third pushes on the second; and so on until all our shares are sold. The rings are pushed forward until they drop off; that is, until each set of shares has matured. You receive as a shareholder your proportion of the joint profits of the society, and so your share acquires the value of 200 dollars, although you have paid, it may be, only 96 dollars in monthly instalments. A calculation is made every month as to the value of each set of shares,

and as fast as the shares mature they may be dropped in as new stock or may be paid back to the shareholder.

Who does not remember the great number of beautiful houses of moderate cost lining the streets of Philadelphia with marble thresholds? Thousands of these houses are owned by working-men, who have paid for them by the assistance of money saved or loaned in co-operative banks such as I have described. The standard name for these associations is building societies; but that is a great misnomer. They are not necessarily engaged in building. They may assist working-men to build homes of their own; but it is best to call these associations mutual savings and loan societies, the name the law gives them in Massachusetts. That misnomer, building societies, has misled many. The money loaned by these societies may be employed in any enterprise, and not necessarily in building; and yet in Philadelphia about a hundred thousand homes have been put up under the encouragement of such societies.

It is most interesting to study the gatherings of the people who are interested in these co-operative savings and loan associations. The monthly meetings in Philadelphia are often held in quite inexpensive halls; and the more inexpensive the place the better, for it gives the impression that the bank is not extravagant. In the line of people filing up to the clerk's desk you see the sprucely dressed clerk, the poor shop-girl in faded calico, the substantial head of a family, worth 20,000 dollars perhaps; then it may be some small capitalist, or a poor widow, or a shop-boy. They all come to pay their dollar for their monthly instalment and get their pass-books signed. If a young couple wish to found a home of their own, and if their instalments have been regularly paid, and they have the power to pay that small amount of a dollar a month and will mortgage the house they propose to build, why, they may borrow enough to build a home for themselves, and there is very little risk to the bank. These co-operative credit societies are ready to buy back shares of their own as frequently as possible. When a share is bought back, only six per cent. on the money paid in is allowed to the withdrawing stockholder, and, as the money has made sometimes ten per cent., the bank has considerable profit in buying back the shares; and so it is for the interest of stockholders sometimes to let a small debt remain in this bank. If the young couple who borrowed capital keep on paying their instalments, they find that in 96 months every 96 dollars they pay may amount to 200 dollars. If they have shares enough, pretty soon the mortgage on their house is sent back to them clean paper, and they have a home of their own, and they have obtained it by money advanced through these savings and loan associations. No

help from the state; no help from the capitalists. Self-help from first to last. Here is another application of the principle of the famous German savings bank established by Schulze Delitzsch and doing now in Germany 300,000,000 dollars of business annually. This system may not be best for large sums of money, but it is the best yet invented for capital collected in small sums, and the plan is capable of indefinite expansion.

These associations are not a scheme, but a growth. The origin of mutual savings and loan societies is obscure; but they have been known in England and Germany for two generations. Let me summarize fifty years of their history by pointing to two high table-lands of fact, on which I hope you will pace thoughtfully to and fro, if you are Socialists.

19. The total number of mutual savings and loan societies established in England and Wales cannot be less than 5,000 or 6,000. In 1872 a royal commission estimated the total assets of building societies in Great Britain in 1870 at seventeen millions of pounds, and their annual income at eleven millions.

20. In 1870 Philadelphia reported 112,366 houses for a population of 674,022; while New York had 64,044 houses for 942,392 inhabitants. One hundred thousand independent homes in Philadelphia are mostly the results of savings and loan associations among working-men.*

Consider what the moral effect of the permeation of the working classes by co-operative savings and loan associations must be! How economy and self-help in every form are inspirited! Instead of dozing over the hope of aid from political money, and looking toward spoliation, and an irredeemable paper currency, and forced loans, and the oratory of demagogues for communistic or socialistic support, how securely are the working-man and his wife, under the lead of experience, brought to look for assistance to self-help, and not to state-help! They are pointed to the ancient and safe road to wealth, through industry and economy. They respect themselves. They are socialistic leeches on no part of the body politic. They acquire habits which are the glory of society and the strength of the state. They build homes of their own; and what they build they will

---

* See in *Scribner's Monthly*, February, 1876, an illustrated article by Charles Barnard on "A Hundred Thousand Homes." The best American authority on the topic of co-operative credit societies is Edmund Wrigley's volume, "How to Manage Building Associations," second edition, 1876. This work is published by James K. Simon, No. 29, South Sixth Street, Philadelphia. See also "A Plea for the Incorporation of Co-operative Loan and Building Societies," by Josiah Quincy. Boston: Wright & Potter, 1875.

defend. Give me a world encircled with self-help among workingmen; give me firesides numerous enough to be in sight of each other on a line extending once around the earth, and made bright by family virtues such as self-help inspires, and I will show you a globe encircled in a ring of fire that will burn off the planet all the ulcerous growths of communistic and socialistic disease.

COMMON SCHOOLS, HIGH SCHOOLS, AND THE POOR.

Prelude.—The Bible in Public Schools.

Sectarian secularism or the Bible in schools, which? Romanism or the Bible in schools, which? These are the four distinct alternatives which lie capsulate in the one topic of the Bible in schools. The whole subject is in slatternly confusion until these details are separated from each other and studied analytically. The place of the Bible in schools will be occupied by the power which displaces it. That which displaces and takes the place of the Bible in schools will have an important place.

Romanism clamours for the exclusion of the customary devotional exercises from our common schools, and the question on that side of the subject is whether the Romish devotional exercises, which would displace and take the place of the others, if Romanists had their way, would be better for our schools and the nation than the present unsectarian exercises. On the other side of the subject the question is whether dogmatic atheism, a thorough-going sect now, although a small one, in several cities of this country, would be better, with its pale negations, its utterly monstrous sciences, and its unscientific spirit, than the present Christian atmosphere of our schools as a climate in which to train the young souls of the land. If secularism displaces the Bible in schools, it will take the place of it there. If Romanism displaces the Bible in schools, it will occupy the place of it. If the two, in a political coalition, displace it, they will together share the place of it. My political philosophy I have learned from Edmund Burke. I am not here to defend any paper constitution or fine-spun theory as to the relations of Church and State. The question concerning the Bible in the schools is to be treated as one of expediency and decided by the light of experience. What would be the effects of giving Romanism or secularism the place in our schools which the spirit of unsectarian Christianity has now? Our first duty on this theme is to consult history and the laws of the self-preservation of free nations.

It is an interesting circumstance that Germany, under the lead of infidelity, once drove the Bible from its schools; but has since restored it. The most learned land on the globe, incisively divided between Catholic and Protestant, infidel and believer, scouts the idea that the Bible is to be excluded from the common schools. "I inquired of all classes of teachers," says Professor Stowe,* "and men of every grade of religious faith, instructors in common schools, high schools, and schools of art; of professors in colleges, universities and professional seminaries; in cities and in the country; in places where there was a uniformity and in places where there was a diversity of creeds, and I never found but one reply, and that was that to leave the moral faculty uninstructed was to leave the most important part of the human mind undeveloped and to strip education of almost everything that can make it valuable. Every teacher whom I consulted repelled with indignation the idea that moral instruction is not proper for schools, and spurned with contempt the allegation that the Bible cannot be introduced into common schools without encouraging a sectarian bias in the matter of teaching." Horace Mann gives

* "Report on Elementary Instruction in Europe."

similar testimony. But the sentiments which Professor Stowe describes are the result of a reaction itself produced by a battle on this very topic of the Bible in schools, and fought for eighty years, on both sides, with the keenest Damascus blades. The question of the relations of the Bible to national education is not a novel one. America will not enter upon its discussion without the light of historical precedents. These are not so far from being parallels to its own circumstances as to be without profound significance.

Rousseau's Emille did not begin the discussion of the exclusion of the Bible from schools. It was rather the tinkle of the bell that caused the precipitation upon this question of the avalanche of infidelity that had accumulated on the Continent during the literary ascendancy of Voltaire and the reign of Frederick the Great. Johann Bernhard Basedow, the celebrated German writer on education, from whom sprang the famous Basedow institutions that were the fashion in Germany from 1776 to about 1800, derived his educational principles largely from Rousseau. For the publication of Basedow's principal work on education the Empress of Russia, Catharine II., contributed a thousand crowns and the King of Denmark nine hundred. Basedow was the universal favourite. In 1774 he opened at Dessau a philanthropical institute, to test the practical worth of his ideas. Undoubtedly, the old pedantic stiffness of the German schools was largely diminished by Basedow's movement. He attacked many real abuses in the schools, and effected on many points a needful transition to the state the German primary educational institutions now occupy. But time showed which of his principles were sound and which unsound. The special success of his treatise on education had arisen from its indifferent tone as to religion.

Professor Tholuck, of Halle, was accustomed to put Professor Hagenbach's work on "German Rationalism: its Rise, Progress, and Decline" first on the list of authorities as to its themes. A passage in this scholarly history deserves sharp attention from any who think the effect of the Bible in schools is small or that the effect of its absence could not be great. A prime object with Basedow was to exclude all positive religious instruction, and to build chiefly upon the conception of the dignity of the human soul. Such conceptions were very attractive to many persons. Basedow was not long without eager followers, of whom Saltzmann and Campe, students of his at Dessau, were the most noted. Similar institutes sprang up elsewhere, and the principles adopted by Basedow were grafted upon the domestic training of children. "Immediate changes," says the historian, as if recording a lesson from the present hour in America, "were perceived. In place of the old pedantic stiffness, there came a jocose levity; and, instead of religious instruction as given heretofore, there ensued a general effort to develop as from within the capacities of the soul. A universal superficiality of knowledge followed, a want of consistency in moral and religious training, and a premature scepticism among youth. The meagreness of Basedow's scheme proved its bane and prepared the way for the conviction that a balanced educational science must rest on a positive Christian foundation."

This page of German history is the more worthy of heed because the reaction took place in spite of many acknowledged merits in Basedow's system. It took place in spite of the vehement advocacy of that system by Saltzmann and Campe It took place in spite of the influences of German rationalism in moulding the German educational system.

Rousseau, Basedow, Saltzmann, and Campe advocated much that was adopted by Pestalozzi, who has been called the schoolmaster of the human race. But their principle of the exclusion of a Christian basis from common schools Pestalozzi was far from adopting. This greatest of educational reformers died, as you

remember, in 1826. He encouraged in the most emphatic manner youthful acquaintance with the Bible. He regarded the history contained in the Gospels as an indispensable ingredient in the education of every young mind. "I consider," he wrote in 1820, in a report to the public, "a thorough knowledge of the scriptural histories, and especially of the life, sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, and the study of the sublimest passages of the Bible, with a childlike, believing spirit, the beginning and essence of what is necessary for religious instruction; and then, above all things, a fatherly care to make the children feel the worth of prayer offered in faith." Pestalozzi's own theological sentiments were not what are known as Orthodox. It is extremely unsafe to say that the present position of Germany as to the Bible in schools arises from the union in Germany of the Church with the State. The Church was connected with the State in Basedow's time, as well as in Pestalozzi's. Speculation was as free in the time of the latter as in that of the former. Neither can it be said that this history exhibits only a temporary swell of opinion. It extends over a period of eighty extraordinary years. Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Richter, and Goethe are the names that illuminate the epoch. In no other period has German thought been so searching and free. But the result of eighty years of discussion has fixed the theory and practice of Germany in favour of a Christian basis in schools. The history of the acutest educational discussions of the last eighty years asks America not to go back from Pestalozzi to Basedow.

When the National Assembly at the head of the French Revolution wished to extirpate Christianity in France, they adopted a system secularizing education in the primary schools. The majestic eloquence of Edmund Burke was stirred against this scheme. "These enthusiasts," he wrote, "do not scruple to own their opinion that a State can subsist without any religion better than with one, and that they are able to supply the place of any good which may be in it by a project of their own—namely, by a sort of education that they have imagined, founded in a knowledge of the physical wants of men, progressively carried to an enlightened self-interest, which, when well understood, they tell us will identify with an interest more enlarged and public. The scheme of this education has long been known. Of late they distinguish it, as they have got an entire new nomenclature of technical terms, by the name of a *Civic Education*." It is stated on high authority that when the French Revolution was over, a committee sent to Paris by one of the religious societies of London to ascertain the moral condition of the people, searched four days in all the bookstores and print-shops of the city before they could find a single copy of the Bible.

So much for German history. But you say that in America we have a Constitution that ignores religion. Well, if you please, the question concerning the Bible in schools is a matter to be decided under state constitutions, and not under the Federal law; and there are very few state constitutions that are not so drawn as to justify literally the opinion of Kent and Story and Webster that Christianity is a part of the common law under our state governments. Indeed, Webster went so far as to say that it is a part of the common law which the Supreme Court of the United States is bound to respect in cases to be decided exclusively under Federal enactment.

1. General, tolerant Christianity is in the United States a part of the common law; but state aid to religious organizations is fundamentally contrary to the spirit of American institutions.

We all remember how Thomas Jefferson came home from France full of indignation that there had not been incorporated into our Constitution, as it then stood, a provision separating Church and State. We remember the aid he gave to the

movement by which the great words "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," were made the first amendment of our national organic law. It is important, however, to notice that, though the Congress is prohibited by the National Constitution from making laws concerning establishments of religion, the states are not. Education is a matter left to the regulation of the individual states. If any state chooses not to have a common-school system, the General Government cannot interfere. In proving, therefore, that in the United States general tolerant Christianity is a part of the common law, it is pertinent to quote, when the question relates to the connection of the common law with the common schools, the decisions of state judicial authorities.*

The National Government appoints days of fasting and prayer. It employs in its judiciaries and in the induction of officers to their responsibilities a system of Christian oaths. It has at different times granted subsidies to various religious denominations for the support of missionaries to teach the Christian religion among the Indian tribes. But the provisions of state law containing distinctively Christian principles are innumerable. Most of our legislatures exempt the family Bible from execution; provide that each apprentice shall be supplied with one; require that a Bible shall be in the hands of every inmate of a jail, penitentiary, and reformatory institution; that the halls of legislation and courts shall be supplied with copies of the Bible; appoint Christian chaplains in the public service; secure the observance of the Christian Sabbath; and punish blasphemy. All this is at the public expense. The language of the state constitutions needs no exemplification, although possibly the grand passage in the Massachusetts constitution should be mentioned as the best illustration.

It is sometimes said, however, that there is in the National Constitution nothing to indicate that our Government has imbedded within it any distinctively Christian principles. It is true that the general Constitution does not refer to religion, except to guarantee its freedom and prohibit an establishment of it. The Declaration of Independence only recognizes the existence of a Creator and the derivation from Him of human rights. But, in the great ordinance of 1787, made for the territories north-west of the Ohio, there is something explicit. This ordinance has acquired great fame in the discussions concerning slavery. It stands upon a height of historic dignity surpassed by none of the early acts of the general government. In this great state paper a compact was entered into between the thirteen original states and the people of the territory north-west of the Ohio. The articles of compact were to remain "for ever unalterable, unless by common consent." The preamble declares the object of the articles of the compact to be the "extending the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty, which forms the basis wherever those republics, their laws and constitutions, are erected; to fix and establish those principles as the basis of all laws, constitutions, and governments, which for ever hereafter shall be formed in said territory." And the third article, which reappears in equivalent language in the constitutions of all the states of the North-west, is in these most significant words: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education shall for ever be encouraged."

---

* See Webster's argument in the Girard College case; and also Vidal *et al. vs* Girard's executors, 2 Howard's Reports, 198. Compare the case of the Commonwealth *vs.* Kneeland, 23 Pickering, 206; and also that of Lindenmuller *vs.* the People, 33 Barbour's Supreme Court Reports, New York, 548.

That is the language of no sect, political or religious, and of no individual theorist; but of solemn, national, fundamental, American law.

No, no! There is a French Revolution Republicanism. There is an American Republicanism. The basis of the one is French philosophy. The basis of the other, as declared by the ordinance of 1787, is Christian ethics. This distinction is vital to a degree, important beyond comment. Whoever does not perceive it does not understand American history. There is a Red Republicanism. There is an American Republicanism. We must insist on this distinction, or we are ruined. It is time to proclaim this distinction in the face of European theories and of European immigration; and to proclaim also that in America American ideas must prevail.

The ordinance of 1787 contains the principle on which the question as to the Bible in schools is to be settled. It is the necessity of morality to good government and the happiness of mankind. It is the right of self-preservation which justifies state recognition of religion. This is the historic ground. This is the philosophical ground. This is the safe ground. This is the American ground. In regard to the educational system, which is a political necessity in a republic, these principles of the ordinance of 1787 are the height on which American voters must plant the national standard.

2. The Romish demand is not for the secularization of common schools; but for state sectarian educational organizations and for the abolition of the present unsectarian common-school system. Extraordinary importance attaches to the production in the public mind of a clear conviction of the truth of this proposition. The evidence supporting it, however, is overwhelming and is every day accumulating. This proposition itself, or its equivalent, has several times been made a part of a Papal syllabus. Of this the language of Romish ecclesiastics and Catholic newspapers is but the echo.

3. The Romanists' objection that the common schools are godless would only be, as they themselves assert, increased in emphasis by the exclusion of the Bible from the schools; and such exclusion would, therefore, while satisfactory to a small minority of infidels and atheists, only add vigour to the dangerous attempts of the Catholic party to subvert the common-school system.

4. In regard to the demand for state sectarian educational organizations, the true policy is to resist their formation at all hazards.

The formation of state sectarian schools is to be resisted in the first place, because it would give no sufficient assurance of a good plain education for all the children of the state. It would undermine the efficiency of our secular instruction in schools. The division of public funds for educational purposes among the numberless religious sects of the country would destroy the efficiency of the school system, and leave no adequate provision for that public intelligence which is necessary to the permanence of republican institutions.

State sectarian institutions for education are to be resisted, in the second place, because they would convert the appliances of education into means of proselytizing, intensify religious clannishness, and give all education, both secular and religious, a sectarian bias from the first.

They are to be resisted, in the third place, because the state cannot deny to others what it grants to Catholics, and must, therefore, if it aids the latter on the ground of religious scruples, aid infidel and atheistic sects on the same grounds, and thus finds itself the ally of public immorality.

They are to be resisted, in the last place, because they would include many of the causes of the historic evils of the connection of Church and State.

5. Voluntary religious effort on the part of religious organizations, greatly as

its stimulation is to be desired, is too much divided against itself, too fluctuating, and too little possessed of access to the unchurched and of financial strength to be trusted, taken alone, with the tremendous interest of the state in the maintenance of public morality. If the churches were to give the only Christian instruction all the religious instruction children would receive would have a sectarian bias from the first, and the evils of sectarianism would thus be greatly increased.

In America, in spite of all theories as to the freedom of the individual, a certain amount of secular instruction is in several states enforced by law. Disciples of the principle of *laissez faire* in government are not wanting who would have us abandon even this amount of divergence from that doctrine, and trust all moral education to voluntary effort. The voice of history does not give this advice.

The law of supply and demand which is the central principle of the disciples of the system of *laissez faire* in government does not apply to education. The greater the need of this in a population the less the demand for it. But this is true, in a still higher degree, of morality. The more it is needed the less it is demanded. These are the laws of human nature to which some of the disciples of Bentham and Mill have yet to adjust portions of their theories.

We are and are to be a nation of great cities. It is a doubtful future that lies before democracy if the moral education of the perishing and dangerous classes in our chief centres of population is to be left solely to the operation of the law of supply and demand. Estimate the corruption of the judiciary in the City of New York. Estimate the corruption of state legislatures. Estimate the moral disease circulating out of sight below the periodical catastrophes in trade. Suppose the system of *laissez faire* fully applied to our common schools; an education completely secularized; the principle of voluntary effort the sole reliance of the nation for that public morality which is a political necessity, who believes that in fifty years our great cities, within their own borders, at least, would not bring democracy itself into jeopardy? In New York City it is already in jeopardy; I had almost said ruin.

I beg every one's pardon; but what statesman, what civilian, who is a safe adviser in great crises of complicated affairs, expects to do anything so contrary to the lessons of experience, so simple, so foolish, as to trust the interests of this nation in the maintenance of public morality wholly to the operation of anything so fluctuating, so much divided against itself, so little possessed of financial strength and of access to the perishing and dangerous classes, as voluntary religious effort? I do not forget the successes that the voluntary principle has achieved for the Church in America. But the great power of that principle has been in the fact that it operated in the midst of a population trained in the common schools, not merely in secular education, but in morality and in many religious respects as well. Secularize education completely, and throw the entire burden of maintaining public morality upon voluntary effort, and the principle would be put upon trial in circumstances wholly new. A most insignificant fraction of time is devoted, even by active Christians, to moral and religious labour. But the active Christians of a state are in numbers a most insignificant fraction of its population.

6. In regard to the Bible in schools, the true policy, therefore, is to adhere to the established Christian principles of American common law. These are, as fully implied in the language of the nation, in the Ordinance of 1787:

First. "That religion, morality, and knowledge are necessary to good government," and may, therefore, be secured through the common schools, under the right of the state to establish the indispensable foundations of its own permanence.

Second. That the exclusion of a Christian basis from schools would jeopardize public morality.

7. As to the political rights of conscience, the duty of the state to exercise religious toleration is limited by its right of self-preservation.

On the topic of the rights of conscience it is endlessly important to insist on five distinctions, if we would attain clear ideas.

(1.) A distinction between matters in respect to which general society and the individual have a common interest at stake and those in which the individual only has an interest. In the former, government may interfere; in the latter, not.

(2.) A distinction between the legal rights of conscience and the theoretical rights. The former only are capable of such definition as can make them the basis of political action.

(3.) A distinction between the teaching of religion by the state and the recognition of religion by the state.

(4.) A distinction between the relations of religion to the state and its relations to the individual conscience. To the state religion is a means. To the individual conscience it is an end.

(5.) A distinction between the national conscience and the individual conscience. The national authority of the individual conscience is not an American doctrine.

8. In Prussia, Holland, Austria, and Canada, the problem of introducing a Christian unsectarian basis into schools in a manner satisfactory to conflicting sects has been solved. The solution has been found in a system of national education, affording *combined* literary and moral and *separate* religious instruction to children of all Christian persuasions, as far as possible, in the same schools. Apartments are afforded to the children of all the national schools for receiving, outside of the hours of united literary instruction, such separate religious instruction as their parents approve. No attempt is made to interfere with the peculiar tenets of any description of religious pupils. This solution cannot be copied literally in America. But it hints at the methods by which experiment may find a solution consistent with American ideas.

There are two points on which, I think, American sentiment is absolutely clear. The first is that the people of New Haven have been wise in going back to their customary brief unsectarian devotional exercises in schools. The other point is that local option as to the Bible in schools is not to be overridden. Suppose that the town of Oberlin, in Ohio, wishes to have the Bible taught in its schools; suppose, also, that the state of Ohio, through the vote of two or three of its large cities, in the hands of politicians of the third or fourth rank, should wish to exclude the Bible; have they the right to ride rough-shod over Oberlin? When a community wishes to use the Bible in their schools, shall politicians say that they shall not? For one, and as the very least that can be safely claimed, I defend local option as to the use of the Bible in schools. If you turn upon me and say there may be local option against the Bible in certain communities, I reply that the schools in such portions of our population will so rapidly deteriorate that parents will not patronize them, and the evil will be cured by the rivalry of better communities and by emigration.

Let us send forth from Massachusetts no uncertain advocacy of American educational ideas. Let us proclaim that in America American ideas must prevail, the educational as well as the political, for the two are inseparable. Let us adhere to the educational provisions of the constitution of Massachusetts. Let us resist all attack on the grand historic bulwarks of the educational principles of the ordinance of 1787, as gnarled Nahant yonder resists the sea.

The Lecture.

The most alluring swindle that a penny-wise and pound-foolish public economy ever forced upon the masses is a cheap school-teacher. The sons of the rich, whether aided by public law or not, will have good teachers. The sons of the poor, if a false economy is practised as to common and high schools, obtain only third and fourth-rate instructors. Penuriousness as to public schools widens the chasm between rich and poor. A system providing one kind of education for the rich and another for the poor would delight the black angels, because it would lead to the formation in the United States of an ignorant class and of a wide hereditary distinction between the wealthy and the indigent. Every advocate of republican institutions will be forced by political necessity, as well as by philanthropy, to defend the educational rights of the children of the poor. In pleading for the poor, I do not attack the rich, but defend rather the interests of property, by defending the education of the masses, who may learn to steal it through majorities at the ballot-boxes, or to burn it in riot, unless they are educated. If there are any limp, soft aristocrats who think they should not be taxed for high schools, when they send no children to them, I beg leave to say that I am speaking for the protection of such aristocrats when I defend an educational system that opens up the faculties of the child of the poor man until he knows what he can do in the world, and so does not, without reason, accept a position below his ability. It is the glory of American political principles that they bring rivalry into activity in society between the children of the poor and those of the rich, and give the former a chance to aid the latter, by keeping them up to the mark of their own capacity. The children of the rich may easily drop into the disease of luxury unless they are mercilessly held up to their work by the danger of competition. A healthful collision of interests occurs in the great professions when the question arises which shall succeed the better—a Daniel Webster, inured to hardship from the first on the frontier, or the son of a millionaire in the city, who has not been taught to work, physically or mentally. The question is whether Henry Clay, as the mill-boy of the Slashes, if he have fair opportunities in the common and high school, may not so awaken his soul as to perceive what he can do for the nation. It is no slight public benefit when a Horace Greeley, an Edison, or an Abraham Lincoln, born far down in the ranks of social merit, as the aristocrats say, is aroused by the American common-school system and taught that he can teach his age.

The physicians assure us that the best brains in public life usually come out of the country. Six generations in a city often produce such physical deterioration in a family that its public power is lost. Certain it is that in American statesmanship, and I had almost said American authorship and science, the more prominent names are of persons first awakened by the American common-school system, and not lulled in the lap of languid luxury until they had lost that love of exertion which is the unfailing characteristic of high capacity. I would have no child lifted above competition and lulled in the lap of luxury until he loses the sense of what he can do. I would have no child placed too low for competition, and benumbed in the caverns of poverty among the icy masses until he loses the desire to climb. I do a service both to those who slumber in the lap of luxury and to those who lie asleep in the benumbing cold of poverty when I melt out the ice from the caves of want, and send those who are benumbed by it into the sunnier portions of society, to awaken the sleepers there by their competition.

How can high schools be improved?

1. High schools should have practical courses of study and prepare pupils for technical and industrial schools of the upper grades, as well as for colleges.

2. As a school can rise no higher in merit than its teachers, a most thorough examination of the latter should be secured, so that when the people's money is spent for instruction an adequate return may be made certain.

3. County superintendents of instruction, to act in connection with the town school committees, should be appointed in Massachusetts, as they have been in several other states, with power to secure for all teachers in public schools thorough examinations, and for all public schools a trained professional oversight, not influenced by personal, political, or local favouritism.

4. Option should not be given to local school committees to pare down appropriation of funds for school purposes to such a degree that the demands of the state laws as to education cannot be executed.

5. Normal schools, as a department for the teaching of teachers, should be kept in close connection with high schools.

6. The chasm between rich and poor should not be widened by penuriousness as to public school teachers' salaries.

Under the gilded dome beneath which the general court of Massachusetts sits there is at this moment not a little whispering in favour of the plan of allowing the local school committees option to reduce their appropriation for school purposes, according to their own judgment. If this power were given to the local school committees,

no doubt it would often be impossible to execute the state regulations concerning high schools. The most insidious attack on the high schools is made in many of our states by the clamour for option on the part of a few sinecure politicians in our city governments to determine the amount that shall be given to the promotion of the interests of education in their cities. Local politicians can easily starve high schools, or otherwise so mismanage them as to make them useless; but the fault is in the politicians, and not in the schools. In matters of education, experience shows that it is not safe to leave a town political committee without supervision by a state or county board, not influenced by any local, political, social, or personal favouritism.

How shall I properly excoriate the spoliation of the pinched earnings of young women who, as teachers in primary schools, have only 500 dollars to 600 dollars a year for labour in all weathers, in a kind of effort that often undermines the health, and is carried on in many cases while a father and mother may be relying upon the arm of the young woman for support? In 1878, New York City, under the lead of narrow-minded ward politicians, many of whom held sinecure places at fat salaries, undertook to do a little extra stealing. Against the protests of Bryant and Field and scores of the best friends of education, they reduced by 150,000 dollars the pay of the school-teachers. They did not dare, however, to reduce at all the pay of some 1,200 primary school-teachers—that is, of the young ladies who, while labouring in one of the most difficult and important departments, receive only some 600 dollars to 800 dollars a year. But on this thin soil of New England and in sight of Boston there is in progress, I have heard, a paring down of these last lowest salaries; a kind of penuriousness that ought to set the very soil on fire, especially where it lies above the graves of our fathers, one of whose prayers was that the love of good learning might not be buried with them. I hold that, after trial, the meritorious teacher should have the maximum grade of salary. If salaries are penurious, you will send the children of the rich into good private schools, and leave the poor to be instructed by fifth-rate teachers. If salaries are at the mercy of the ward politicians, the best talent will not be attracted into the teacher's profession. Custom and law should insist upon a high and honourable dealing in these matters. You may not give to the new teacher the highest salary at once; but there should be a maximum for each position, and when the teacher has shown merit, that grade of salary should be given and continued.

Why should high schools be maintained?

Before I venture into the contest concerning the abolition of high

schools, I beg leave to put to this audience a single question, on the answer to which may turn the safety of our American liberties in time to come. You ought to know me by this time, and should be convinced that I am no partisan, and that I am not seeking office, and that I speak here with no bitter prejudices against any sect in Church or State. But my question is how it happens that in the last two or three years there has grown up in the United States an opposition to our high schools, and that from Maine to Georgia, and from the Penobscot to the Sacramento, the same arguments are used, the same insinuations thrust into the public prints, the same tentative efforts made in our state legislatures? The perfect unity in the attack made on the high schools proves that somewhere and somehow there is a generalship behind this movement. It is a generalship that can out-general average American editors. It can out-general average American politicians. It is a power behind the newspapers and behind the caucus. It operates against the whole natural drift of American ideas. What is this power—secret, omnipresent, deadly? The attack which it makes uses the same arguments and appeals to the same subtle prejudices from side to side and end to end of the land, and must have a generalship somewhere. My question is: Where?

In the city of Rochester lately a public election uncovered the very innermost fibres of the opposition to the high schools in that town. A leading editor, who is also a lecturer, had opposed what he called secondary education. A governor of New York, Robinson, employed by his political party, appeared to be employed also by some power behind the party. He has twice in grave public messages attacked the high schools in my native commonwealth. In the city of Rochester full light has been turned on the origin of the New York State crusade against the high schools; and indeed, nobody in New York City wanted light turned on. The case was a clear one at the mouth of the Hudson, and I suppose it is a clear one at the mouth of the Charles and the Mystic. The bishop of an Italian priesthood lived at Rochester, and out of his study, and others like it on Manhattan Island, went forth that influence which, over the whole face of the broad territory of New York, put perfect unanimity into the attack on high schools.

There is power in an Italian priesthood and Jesuit teachers to do immense good, as well as evil; and, if I mistake not, there is some hope for the improvement of the Romish Church, through a defeat of it in the United States in its attack on the American common-school system. Because I trust a few Romish priests, who are trying to model their sectarian schools after the plan of the best American high schools; because I wish old Romanism, or rather old

Catholicism without Romanism, to succeed; and because I believe the best way of helping Romanism out of its slough is to cause its overwhelming defeat on the bulwark of American common schools, I propose to expose mercilessly its attack on our system. If Romanists here are offended, I believe that they will be found to be members of that Italian priesthood, and not members of the Catholic laity, on whom I make no attack.

We have but just passed through a civil war to settle the relation of two heterogeneous elements of our population, and barred the gates of the East against the irruption of strife over the African, when the gates of the West open, and through them we already behold a too probable irruption of strife over the Chinese. The German and French infidels are here, and, with the trumpets of the cheap press, and the sounding-board of the perishing and dangerous classes in our great cities, make sad music. Their following is small, but motley and noisy, and with the German and French population not politically unimportant. The Jews are a very considerable body. Spiritualism claims that it has an adherence of millions. But all these differences fade in importance compared with the division of the population between the Protestant and the Roman Catholic faith. I have never been one of those who fear the ultimate supremacy of Romish influence in the religious or political interests of this nation. But I confess that I have found an examination of the most recent statistics a little startling. There are governmental returns showing that the Romish population of the United States doubles every ten years.

If the Roman Catholic population doubles every ten years for the next fifty years, as it has for the last forty, important, perhaps great, events must result. The priest Hecker, in a public lecture, once said in New York: "The Catholic Church numbers one-third of the American population; and if its membership shall increase for the next thirty years as it has for the thirty years past, in 1900 Rome will have a majority and be bound to take this country and keep it."

It is important to notice that there is an immense concentration of Roman Catholic power in the City of New York and in the great cities of the Mississippi Valley. The Brooklyn and New York Catholic cathedrals, which cost millions of dollars, and whose compeers dot most of our large cities, are insignificant facts compared with the circumstances that in New York City, and in some of the cities of the West, Catholics fill nearly every municipal office. In New York, the sheriff, register, comptroller, city chamberlain, corporation counsel, commissioner, president of the water board, president of the board of aldermen, president of the board of councilmen,

clerk of the common council, clerk of the board of supervisors, five justices of the courts of record, all of the civil justices, all but two of the police justices, all of the police court clerks, three out of four of the coroners, two members of Congress, three out of five of the state senators, eighteen out of twenty members of assembly, fourteen out of nineteen of the common council, and eighteen of the supervisors, were very lately all said to be Roman Catholics.* A conflict impends over the common-school system and the whole great and grave theme of national education.

When I was in Wittenberg, in Germany, where Luther nailed up his theses against the church-door, I saw there in bronze, in raised letters, the propositions he defended in the first Protestant Reformation. Under universal suffrage there is, or will be, needed a second Protestant Reformation, to rescue the school, as the first rescued the Bible. Face to face with an Italian priesthood, never more audacious than to-day, and never more dangerous in any country than here, I beg leave to nail upon the door of this Boston audience hall certain American propositions as to schools for the people. I should be grieved if the hammer should seem to have an apologetic sound as it fastens up the propositions which I propose to stand by, although I can do no more than nail them up to-day. They are these :

1. The education of poor children is the Plymouth Rock of American liberty.

2. No more mischievous lie is in public circulation than the assertion that the high schools are maintained by the poor man's money. The poor man pays only a poll tax. The rich support the high schools.

3. The education of poor children, until they show of what they are capable, is the only measure that can give the state the full strength of its citizens.

4. Children are not educated to this degree in the common schools ; but the abler of them may, in the high schools, awaken to a consciousness of their own capacities.

5. So far from its being an objection to high schools that they teach the poor and ignorant to be dissatisfied with their condition, the merit of high schools is that they awaken in poor children that have capacity a dissatisfaction with their condition and an omnipresent spirit of aspiration and self-help.

6. Educated only in the rudiments taught in the common schools,

---

* Clark, Rev. Rufus W., "The Question of the Hour.—The Bible and the School Fund." 1870. p. 22.

the mass of poor children, even when of equal natural ability with the sons of the rich, are not likely to obtain an equipment that will enable them to compete with rich men's children, educated well.

7. The abolition of the high schools, open to the poor, tends, therefore, to widen the chasm between the children of the rich and poor and to make of the latter an inferior class.

8. American institutions cannot bear the existence of permanent, and hereditary class distinctions, based merely on birth and wealth.

9. The high schools are needed as much as military, naval, and agricultural schools. The latter are supported at the public expense, although only a few attend them. The benefit they confer on the whole people is the justification of the tax on the whole people for their support.

10. The high schools are the nursery of that united citizenship which is essential to the perpetuity of American institutions.

11. The high schools are the indispensable nursery of teachers for the public common schools.

12. They are the nursery of industrial schools and of the inventors, who spring from the ranks of labour.

13. They are the nursery of colleges, and of the lawyers, physicians, and preachers which the colleges help to prepare for the service of the people.

14. Secondary instruction gives civilization the benefit of its best leadership. It is a silver link between the iron link of primary and the golden link of liberal education, and gives the best public men a connection closer than they would otherwise have with the masses, and gives the masses a confidence they would not, in America, otherwise attain in their best educated public men.

15. High schools are opposed by and to sectarians, who wish to have all instruction in their own hands, and who attack the common schools, which are the corner-stone of American civilization.

16. The assumption that the children of atheist parents have such rights that the public-school system of the United States should be made atheistic will never be tolerated by the American people.

17. The assumption that an Italian priesthood are representatives of Romish children, and as a foreign power, can make a treaty with our Government and settle all difficulties by dividing the school fund and abolishing the high schools, will never succeed in the United States.

Massachusetts has no hope, except in making herself the teacher

of America. Like little Attica, in Greece, she has a thin, sterile soil. It is good for nothing but to build factories and school houses on. The only figure that you can put up here that will command ultimate respect on the Pacific Coast and on the Father of Waters; the only figure you can put up that will command ultimate respect on the Atlantic Coast, is represented by the colossal statue yonder at the edge of the sea, with its feet on a fragment of the Rock which received to America the feet of our forefathers. The ages will respect no state that is not made up, as the Plymouth monument is, of education, law, morality, freedom, presided over by a genius having in its arms the volume of religious instruction, of political sanity, of patriotism, of pure homes, of self-help, and pointing upward, perpetually—not to a priesthood, not to the dome of St. Peter's; but to the unobscured celestial constellations, with whose motions our political and educational movements must harmonize, if they are not to end in chaos.

TRAMPS, SUNDAY LAWS, AND THE POOR.

Prelude.—The Chinese Question.

A man or a bale of goods can be carried from San Francisco to Canton as cheaply as from San Francisco to Omaha. The geographical nearness of the United States to China may ultimately make our trade with the Celestial Empire larger than that of the British Islands. One of the great events of the thirteenth century was the military invasion of the West by China. One of the great events of the twentieth century appears likely to be the commercial invasion of China by the West.

As Homer said concerning the history recorded in the Iliad, where contests were sometimes successful and sometimes disastrous, so we may say, concerning the great cause of the commercial, political, and religious regeneration of Asia, that in both success and disaster the plans of the gods are advancing. In the success of Great Britain in obtaining a scientific barrier in the Himalayas, and in the defeat in the United States of an unconstitutional bill, insulting China, we have signs of the times pointing to increased confidence in the commercial relations between Great Britain and the United States on the one hand, and the no longer distant East on the other. One-third of the human family as some say, one-fourth as others say, one-fifth as all say, live in the Chinese Empire.

Let us thank God that the crack of the hoodlum's lash, under which an American House of Representatives danced for a day and an hour, and an American Senate bowed its haughty head, has not had force enough to cause in an American Executive the movement of an eyelash. The President of the country has saved us from dishonour. He has saved us, also, from striking a perhaps suicidal blow at great commercial interests. I watch with eagerness the gradual moulding of the candlestick called commercial success in our relations with China, for I believe that on that candlestick is to stand, by and by, the fire containing the light of the religious and the political regeneration of an empire that was old when the Greeks were young.

There was a day in the thirteenth century when the Chinese ensign glassed itself in the Euxine and at the same moment in the Yellow Sea and had authority over the four thousand miles between the two. Ghengis Khan, Kublai Khan, and Tamerlane introduced such order into Asia that, Gibbon says, a child might have carried a purse from east to west, and not have been robbed or intimidated.

When Batun Khan was on the shores of the Venetian Sea, he had more men under his command than Europe could have raised in a quarter of a century. There had been sixty millions of people under the Antonines in Western Europe; but at about the time of the Inquisition it is supposed there were only thirty millions there. Human life was so cheap in Great Britain in the thirteenth century, that a man was sold for less than a hawk. Thomas à Becket wore sheepskins, and it is said his clothing was peeled off his back; so little did sentiment, even among ecclesiastics, insist upon the cleanliness that we now require of the Chinese. There were in the hands of this invading host from the sunrise better arms than Europe possessed at the time. The Chinese had gunpowder and culverins. Except among the Arabs in Spain, who had learned the use of gunpowder

from the Chinese, there were no arms of offence containing gunpowder in all Western Europe. The Chinese knew how to print when they invaded the West.

Ghengis Khan is to us the scourge of God, and so are Kublai Khan and Tamerlane; but to the Chinese each is the propagandist of theism. There were no great spoils to be gathered on the plains of Hungary, on the desolate steppes of Russia, or on the sand stretches of Northern Germany; and there is much reason for asserting that Western Europe was once in the power of China, and that she turned back largely out of religious considerations.

The invasion of the sunset by the sunrise filled all Western Europe, then steeped in poverty, with magnificent ideas concerning the wealth of Kublai Khan. Cathay was the rich country Columbus sought when he entered upon that voyage in which he purposed to find Zipango, or the modern Japan. To the day of his death Columbus thought he had discovered in America simply islands lying on the coast of China and tributary to it. His dream, by the way, has descended to the sand-lots and the admirers of sand-lot oratory, who think we are to be covered by a Mongolian avalanche!

It was to reach the fabulously rich East that many a colony was sent out toward the sunset. The East India Company sprang from the attraction of gold in the sunrise. Commercial enterprise has been stimulated ever since the thirteenth century, partly under the impulse of the dreams raised by the stories of Marco Polo, and by the great power shown by the Mongolian dynasty in the thirteenth century; but of late by the certainty that the opening of the East will bring great commercial advantages to the West.

Only a few years ago, Great Britain drew up her cannon before twenty-one gates of China; and when the rusty hinges would not turn, she blew the gates from the cannon's mouth. She bombarded Canton in 1856; she destroyed a Chinese fleet in 1857; the French and English bombarded and entered Canton in 1858. In 1860 they captured Pekin, and afterwards resisted a rebellion that came near to proving disastrous to the perpetuity of the reigning dynasty in China At this terrific cost, the territory of one-fifth of the population of the globe was opened to the commerce of Great Britain.

When Burlingame secured commercial rights for America in China equal to those of Great Britain there, he was supposed by San Francisco to have achieved a diplomatic victory of the utmost importance to the Pacific Coast. All the cities of the United States united in praise of this great conquest to commerce. The hope of important trade with the East helped to build the Pacific Railway. Benton stands in bronze at St. Louis to-day, looking towards the setting sun and pointing to the Orient along the line of the Pacific Railway, with the words: "There is the East!" How amazing that we should now be told that, after all, our commerce with China is not likely to be extensive, and that we ought not to run any large risks in order to preserve and enlarge it! Great Britain is further off from China than we are, and for fifty years she has been practising justice and injustice, persuasion and force, in order to have a place on the Yellow Sea in which to sell her woollen and her cotton goods.

When the North Pacific Railway is finished, and we sail to China over the small circle of the globe, it will be cheaper to send a man or a bale of goods from the Oregon coast to Canton by water than it is now from San Francisco to Omaha by land.

Great Britain sent to the Chinese Empire, exclusive of goods passing in transit through the colony of Hong Kong, 10,000,000 dollars worth of cotton goods and 4,000,000 worth of woollen goods in 1877. That is the size of the commerce of Great Britain with China, separated from the British looms by half the circum-

ference of the globe. We are soon to be the wealthiest of all nations. Mr. Gladstone has predicted this, and Stuart Mill, in his "Chapters on Socialism," just issued in the *Fortnightly*, begins his discussion by saying that the United States are soon to be the wealthiest of all nations and the most powerful. What is to hinder the United States, so many thousands of miles nearer China than Great Britain is, from ultimately having as profitable a commerce with that empire as the United Kingdom has now? Our merchants in New York City and all along the seaboard understand this topic. When they petitioned Congress, the other day, against the unconstitutional Anti-Chinese Bill, they had this immense commerce of the future in mind. But if they had had before their thoughts only the figures representing our present trade with China, their solicitude would have been justified. I hold in my hand the speech of Senator Hamlin, whom may God bless for the record of his life in opposition to caste, and he represents that last year we sold to China more than two millions and a half worth of manufactured cotton and more than a millions dollars worth of breadstuffs. We sent over a hundred thousand dollars worth of iron and steel. The time is to come when railways will be needed in China.

It is not my business here to shut my eyes upon the antipodes: but, as your outlook committee, I must have in view the fact that the Mediterranean of the modern world is the Pacific Ocean. You send men to South America now to open trade. Your foremost newspapers in Boston and New York print Spanish editions, to obtain a hearing for your manufacturers in advertising columns which go to the South American republics. I sit in the railway trains, and as I ride into New York I often overhear conversations among merchants concerning South America. "If I could leave my business," I heard a man say the other day, "I should devote myself to the building of railways in the southern half of our continent. I hardly care where I might be located. At any point I could have business enough, and with a little capital to start with, the management of railways in those republics would pay enormously." We can awaken New York and Boston to the fact that South America, a territory sparsely populated, is likely to need railways and factories and manufactured goods; and we are arousing the whole seaboard here in order to open a market in that part of the world. Certain parties are endeavouring to corrupt Congress in order to get a subsidy to aid our market in South America. We are awake on that theme; but this immense opportunity in China, which lies as near to us *in time* as two-thirds of South America, we neglect. We cannot see our ultimate colossal interests in China, because, forsooth, some Cheap Jack orator stamps his foot on the sand-lots at San Francisco and raises a dust. Statesmen will look through that dust, although mere politicians can see nothing beyond it.

Where are the men on the cotton plantations of the South, that they do not see that their interests are at stake? Where are the men in the manufactories of New England, that they do not see that here is a market for their goods? More than 40,000 dollars worth of clocks were sent to China from the United States last year. Where is the Connecticut clock-maker ridiculed so much on the Pacific Coast? His instincts I am willing to appeal to, if only you can use them to help hew this candlestick into shape, in which Almighty God by and by will place a candle for the political and religious regeneration of Asia. Senator Hamlin says he cannot bear to think that only fifteen barrels of the flour which now goes by the thousands of barrels from California should be taken by permission of the Chinese Empire in any vessel which traverses the Pacific and lands in China He cannot bear to see the crushing out of our great commercial interests in that direction.

The candle will be far more important than the candlestick. If, this morning, I insist on the commercial argument, it is that I may suggest that the keeping open of right commercial relations with China is the only means of securing there for the United States the rights of the most favoured nation.

Here are the four great propositions that underlie our whole debate concerning the Chinese :

1. We cannot have in China the rights of the most favoured nation there unless we give the Chinese the rights of the most favoured nation here. We ought to be above asking or hoping for more than the rights we grant.

2. Great Britain is not likely to diminish her access to the Chinese Empire. She opened it by force ; she holds it now by force. The Chinese gates are not likely ever to be closed against Great Britain and the west of Europe ; and, therefore, our trade with China will be subjected to rivalry.

3. If we please, we may outrival Great Britain herself in the ports of the Chinese Empire in our commercial activity. Are we to allow the vast commerce of the Orient to be controlled by a few favoured nations ?

4. If we do not here treat the Chinese fairly, if we do not respect our treaty obligations when they are once settled in the regular form, we are sure to strike a blow at this gigantic commerce, which is the best hope of the political and religious regeneration of Asia.

In opposition to this series of weighty considerations, which have given a right attitude to the Atlantic seaboard and to the larger part of the Mississippi Valley, what have the opponents of Chinese emigration to say ? Senator Blaine's speech against the Chinese was skilful, but not wise. I take his objections to Chinese emigration as summarizing the California side of this theme, so far as California's opinion has yet been heard. Much significance lies in the silences in California. A bishop did telegraph that he wished the President not to veto the Anti-Chinese Bill. Six or eight ecclesiastics sent a similar protest ; but six or eight hundred other ecclesiastics did *not* send such a protest. The Morton Committee of 1876 testified* that religious teachers in California were opposed to the anti-Chinese crusade. I have on my person letters from San Francisco, private communications, speaking of the terror that fills cultivated circles in many quarters of that state, and even at the head-quarters of this discussion. I have a letter from a lawyer, in which he speaks of large parts of the state as under terrorism. The opinions found in the leading articles of the California newspapers are not always an accurate indication of the private sentiments of editors. The *Evening Post* of New York, the other day, published evidence that one of the foremost editors of California, whose paper vehemently attacks the Chinese, is in favour of Chinese immigration.

The anti-Chinese side has insisted openly on ten points and secretly on one other. I think the secret objection, which I shall mention last, has had more political influence than all the ten objections that are discussed in public. If I do not pause long on any of these first ten objections, I shall be excused by you, because the veto is a sufficient reply to them all.

1. It is objected that the Chinese immigrants are coolies.

This is disproved by the testimony of the best observers. Mr. Gibson, who has been ten years a missionary in China and six or eight in San Francisco, testifies that the most of those who come to San Francisco appear there voluntarily. He explains that the Six Companies do not allow a Chinaman to return to China without paying his debts in this country. This regulation sometimes prevents a

* Page iv of Report.

Chinaman from embarking for home, and so appears to be like the law of a master for his slave; but it is only a righteous regulation of those companies to keep their men out of debt. Senator Morton's views on the Chinese question, published by Congress, contain these sentences: "The evidence established the fact that Chinese labour in California is as free as any other. They all come as free men and are their own masters absolutely."* The vetoed bill had in it no provision against involuntary immigration, and so proves its insincerity on this point.

2. It is objected that China, by permitting coolies to come here, has broken her treaty with the United States.

This fails of proof in the failure of the first proposition. The Secretary of State and the President make no such charge.

3. It is objected that the Chinese are nearly or quite beyond the reach of Christianization.

Protestant missionaries have been in China forty years and have 15,000 Christian converts. Roman Catholic missionaries have been there 250 years and have 800,000. The Tae-Ping Rebellion was originated by a native who was friendly to Christianity, and would have succeeded but for the intervention of the arms of England and France. At Pekin there is a National University, with English and American professors. The Chinese Government sends hundreds of its best young men to America for education. In San Francisco hundreds of Chinese emigrants have been baptized. Mr. Blaine says the Chinese are very difficult subjects for Christianization, and he appears to have no hope that religious effort will alter their habits. These are facts which it was convenient for him to overlook.

4. It is objected that the Chinese are unassimilable.

This fails of proof in the failure of the objection that they cannot be Christianized. The Chinese students in the East are not unpopular in their classes. Yung Wing married an American lady. He was a graduate of Yale College and received from that institution the degree of doctor of laws. One of the best informed witnesses brought before the Morton Committee in San Francisco, in 1876, said: "There is not a grander man on the face of the earth than this same Yung Wing. He is a noble fellow. I want you to get acquainted with him. He has a grand head—a Daniel Webster head. He is an American citizen now."†

5. It is objected that the Chinese are corrupting.

Only to those who are already spoiled; and, if the statements of sand-lot oratory are true, only to those who are doubly and quadruply spoiled, and have rolled in iniquity till they have burned out their own eyes. The vices of the Chinese are dangerous only to the dissipated, and dissipation begins in San Francisco at the American gambling hells and in the American whiskey dens. It is the duty of American law to repress and eradicate the iniquities of both the white and the yellow race on the Pacific Coast. Families with Chinese servants in them do not complain of this corruption. What is the trouble on the Pacific Coast, when we are told that the Chinese corrupt everything they touch, and in the same breath are assured that nobody can compete with them as house servants in the first families!

6. It is objected that the Chinese will come to America in overwhelming numbers.

The tide of emigration, the President says, is confessedly receding. Only about 200,000 have come in twenty-five years. The population of China is probably not

---

* Page 13.
† Report, p. 464.

over three hundred millions. "There is a great probability that the present population of China, devastated as the country has been by internecine wars and occasional famines, does not surpass three hundred millions."* I do not know any better authority than Martin's celebrated "Year Book;" and that volume, speaking in the face of the scholarship of the world, undertakes to say that the average estimate of four hundred and fifty or four hundred millions is not justified.

7. It is objected that our commerce with China is unimportant.

That of Great Britain is not, and ours may become larger than hers. Our commerce with China, imports and exports put together, amounted in the last year to 24,000,000 dollars.

8. It is objected that the Chinese underbid and degrade American labour.

The wages paid to Chinamen in California are notoriously as high as those paid to similar grades of workmen in the East. Extortionate wages are asked by white labour in California. Such wages ought to be reduced and must ultimately fall.

9. It is objected that there will be riot on the Pacific Coast if the immigration of the Chinese is not suppressed.

No disturbance has been caused there by the veto. I listened last night for the stamp of Kearney's foot on the sand-lots; but my impression is that the heaviest impact of that weapon on American soil will cause no tremour beyond the sand-lots hereafter. The undercurrent of the best California sentiment is not represented by the anti-Chinese vetoed bill.

10. It is objected that the Chinese immigrants are not naturalized, and that it is unsafe to have a large population here who cannot vote.

In 1870 Charles Sumner voted for striking out the word "white" from the naturalization laws. Massachusetts has naturalized Chinese, as being nearer white than black. The hesitancy over a shade of colour is the worst form of the spirit of caste. Oh! for another hour of Charles Sumner.

11. But lastly, it is objected secretly that the political interests of republicanism and democracy in a closely-contested presidential election require the vote of California, and so a compromise with this hoodlum bill.

This is said to be the only argument used in private conversation at Washington by the friends of the late Chinese measures. It is presumably the only one used with entire sincerity. Its character is such that it will not bear to be employed publicly, and so it needs no reply except its exposure to the light.

Caste! Race prejudice! Colour! These are words of fearful omen in American history. Central syllables of the anti-Chinese crusade, they remind us torturingly of the pro-slavery cry, which was put down yesterday in the United States at the cannon's mouth. California has in it men who threaten secession while the muzzles of the cannon that suppressed secession are yet smoking!

An American senator was lately represented in a cartoon with a Negro leaning on his breast and holding a ballot. The Burlingame Treaty was under the senator's feet, and in the background stood a Chinaman, wrapped in his silks, and behind him were the porcelain vases and boxes of tea, indicative of the rich commerce that may spring up between the sunset and the sunrise. "Am I not a man and a brother?" was the language of the Chinaman to Senator Blaine, as he stood in the centre of Thomas Nast's eloquent group. I fear that years hence the good deeds of the senator whose opinions I oppose may only add to the emphasis with

* "Statesman's Year Book" for 1879, p. 664.

which his dereliction from the stern duties of the present hour will be reproved by the muse of history. New England is terribly in earnest on the topic of caste. My generation has suffered in this country in order to put down caste, and abhors the party cry of race prejudice in American politics. I lift up the arm of my generation, the other was shot away at Gettysburg, and this arm that is lifted up is yet bandaged: and I undertake to say to any senator and to any representative who votes for caste—that is, for excluding a taxpayer who is orderly and industrious and temperate from the rights of an American citizen, simply because of his colour, or, as in the case of the Chinese, for merely a shade of colour—I venture to tell any such man that I, for one, will never lift arm or voice to give or invite others to give a vote for him! I believe that my generation, that has suffered so much to put down the influence of caste in this country, will not. I remember the noble record of this politician; but he forgets it, and the fact of his forgetfulness my generation will remember. Only he, among New England senators, has clothed himself in Kearneyism. The genius of American history looks down on this lost leader, and says to him, in Shakespeare's words:

> "Hast thou not spoke like thunder on my side?
> Been sworn my soldier? bidding me depend
> Upon thy stars, thy fortune, and thy strength?
> And dost thou now fall over to my foes?
> Thou wear a lion's hide! Doff it for shame,
> And hang a calfskin on those recreant limbs."
>
> —"*King John*," *act iii., scene* 1.

The Lecture.

Let us suppose ourselves to be travelling in disguise with a group of tramps, and that we lead them into a frank expression of their plans concerning pelf. Nearly every tramp has a piece of chalk of which the mark will not wash out in the rain. I obtained such a piece myself from tramps at Pittsburgh. One of the vagabonds explains to the company how he marks gate-posts. A single circle, without any line across it, means you can obtain bread and clothing in the house behind the gate on which the mark is made. A similar circle, with a single line across it, means that you can obtain food there, but no clothing. A circle with two lines across it means that you will find a dog there and will do well to beware. All up and down the Mississippi Valley gate-posts are marked by cabalistic signs. They differ in different localities; but these are the ones I found in use in Western Pennsylvania.

In the lonely country side your tramp is often king; for the head of a household may be at a distance in the field. Unless a dog protects the family, it is in danger from any tramp that dares to be violent. Explaining these signs at a dinner-table in St. Louis, and again in Chicago, and again in Louisville, I found on each occasion persons in the company who had seen these signs on their own gate-posts, but never knew what they meant. They were explained to

me by a city missionary, who had lived much among the tramps. It is the opprobrium of American law that tramps can strike terror into the lonely country homes. What is the shame to our police arrangements when tramps attack railways, turn out part of the passengers, if necessary, or bind the officers of the train, man the train themselves, and so obtain transit from place to place? Several times trains have been run by tramps into towns on important Western railroads. Some of the Western States have given managers of railway trains power to act as constables, and to take life, if necessary, in protection of the company. When I rolled through Iowa, across billowing prairie land as fat as Mesopotamia, I was told that it was not always safe on the railway to wear a fur hat; for, when a train is boarded by tramps, the first men they seize on or try to pick the pockets of are those who are fairly well dressed. The traveller is now and then seriously advised, even this side of Omaha, to dress in rather rough costume and to endeavour to appear impecunious, as a means of safety.

This interruption of railways, this intimidation of families by tramps, are not startling signs of the times, you say; but go to the sunrise end of the great bridge at St. Louis, and look at the encampments of tramps there. The moment a riot occurs on the other side, in the city, they pour across that bridge for pelf. They understand each other by various signs left on their run-ways. At Pittsburgh, the moment the riot burst out, down came these ravenous hordes from the mountains and the mines and the country outside, much as in the French Revolution roughs and thieves poured into Paris. As the vultures gather to carrion, so the tramps to a riot in a great city.

What shall be done with tramps? I would place them in workhouses; but how shall the roving idlers and beggars and thieves who deserve arrest be caught? I should like to have a regulation that there be appointed, but not publicly proclaimed, a day each summer for hunting tramps. You cannot expect the farmer to leave his work and get the tramp arrested who insults his family or burns his reaping machines; but if you will have a secret understanding among the constables of Massachusetts that on such a day, say the third of July, the power of all the officers shall be put forth at once to catch these vagabonds, and if the constables let into the secret some of the most active men of the different towns, the tramps will have no opportunity to run from the borders of one town and obtain freedom in another. You will swoop up all the vagabonds in Massachusetts in one attack; and your activity will amount to something, because it is carried on during one day.

As John Milton said, however, an ounce of activity used as prevention is worth a hundred pounds used as a cure. And, therefore I would have these tramps, when gathered into the workhouse, taught morals, as well as how to earn their board and add something to the income of the state. Let all these men whom you have swooped up as vagabonds on Massachusetts soil be brought here for a few minutes, while I discuss, with fearful frankness, the methods by which I would rid the land of the unconscientious unemployed class. Take the case in the concrete; bring these tramps here; lookat them, and tell me how you will effectually mend them.

There may be ministers here who think these tramps in their youth have been sufficiently taught and laboured with by the church. I am not of that opinion. There may be socialists here who think that when these tramps are arrested and incarcerated they are unjustly used. I am not of that opinion. A socialist newspaper at Chicago, the only English sheet of the kind in the United States, publishes weekly a set of resolutions by the Socialistic Labour Party denouncing anti-tramp laws; but the Northern States are, most of them, passing such laws. The men who denounce anti-tramp laws and act out their opposition politically are likely to be tramped upon by American common sense.

Nevertheless, if we are to rid society of these roughs, sneaks, thieves, thugs, we must go back to the work of diffusing conscientiousness in society. Let it begin in the home; let it—for reasons which I undertook to give on another occasion—go on in the school. But, after all that the home and the school can do for the perishing and the dangerous class, I am not at all sure that we shall not have a large population utterly unprincipled, as most of these tramps are.

How have our present tramps come into existence? Under and in spite of the American school system; under and in spite of the American system of training children in families; under and in spite of all the precautions that our fathers thought would bring us out of our difficulties under universal suffrage. The tramp population is so large now, when we have not occupied one acre in ten of our territory, as to be a terror to railways. We blame the German for his Sunday attendance on beer gardens; but you have little rebuke for American railways that drive their trains from Plymouth Rock to the Golden Gate on the Lord's day.

These are the propositions on which I insist:

1. Co-operation implies a high degree of honesty and fails without it.

2. Until conscientiousness is thoroughly diffused through society, there can be no effective harmonization of the interests of labour and capital.

3. Safe republicanism under universal suffrage consists of the diffusion of liberty; the diffusion of intelligence; the diffusion of property, when it is earned, and of the opportunity to earn it; and of the diffusion of conscientiousness.

4. There can be no diffusion of conscientiousness adequate to protect society from danger, under free suffrage, unless a day is set apart for the periodical moral and religious instruction of the masses.

5. Sabbath laws are justified in a republic by the right of self-preservation.

6. They are also justified by Divine command.

7. The Sabbath is the only adequate teacher of political sanity.

8. It is the poor man's day of rest.

9. The enemy of laws providing opportunity for the religious instruction and the physical rest of society is the enemy of the working masses.

10. Among the enemies of the masses, therefore, are to be reckoned.

(1.) Railroads that break Sunday laws.

(2.) Sunday swindling public amusements.

(3.) The opponents of the laws for closing rum-shops on Sundays.

(4.) Immigrants who favour the Parisian Sunday.

(5.) Churches, Romish or Protestant, that turn half of Sunday into a holiday.

(6.) Secularists, who would abolish all Sunday laws. The latter propose anti-religious tests. If the business of the country is to go on during Sundays, as on Mondays, Christians cannot hold office. It is a condition of the service of any railroad or other establishment unnecessarily run on Sundays that the employés shall not be Christians.

A peculiar Christian law, you say, justifies Sunday observance in this country. A peculiar Christian law justifies monogamy; and we have lately had a decision, from the Supreme Court itself, that polygamy can be opposed under the law of this nation. Well, monogamy is a distinctively Christian institution, and if, according to the highest authority known to our courts, we have a right to oppose polygamy and uphold monogamy, I hold that we are in that doing something as distinctively Christian as we are when we uphold fair, tolerant Sunday laws. If you attack the latter, I point you to our judicial decision as to the former, and tell you, that in the United States we

are, after all, based politically upon the foundations not of the French, but of American Republicanism. Not Mirabeau, not the leaders of the Reign of Terror, are our prophets in America; but Washington, and Adams, and Madison, and the men who so founded New England upon moral training that property can be safely diffused here.

An important distinction exists between Sunday observance as a *religious* ordinance and as a *civil* institution. American courts, while enforcing the Sunday laws, disclaim interference with religion. They base these laws on various secular grounds, among which are the right of all classes to rest, so far as practicable, on one day in seven; the right to undisturbed worship on the day set apart for this purpose by the great majority of the people; the decent respect which should be paid to the institutions of the people; the value to the state of the weekly rest-day, as a means of that popular intelligence and morality on which free institutions depend for their maintenance.

The supreme court of New York, in sustaining one of the Sunday laws, says: "The act complained of here compels no religious observance, and offences against it are punishable not as sins against God but as injurious to and having a malignant influence on society. It rests upon the same foundation as a multitude of other laws upon our statute-book—such as those against gambling, lotteries, keeping disorderly houses, polygamy, horse-racing."

The action of the state as to Sunday laws proceeds upon the principle that the liberty of rest for each depends on a law of rest for all.

Is it said that nothing can be done to secure the observance of Sunday laws in large towns! Nearly half the population of New York City are foreigners by birth and habits. A transient population, estimated at thirty thousand, of sailors, visitors, travellers, swirls through the town. Yet, with the exception of certain parts of the city, occupied almost exclusively by foreigners, the suspension of business and the quiet and order which mark the streets on Sabbath are a constant surprise to strangers. The noisy crying of newspapers and other wares on Sunday, which a few years ago was such a nuisance in New York, and which is still tolerated in other of our cities, is suppressed. Under the excellent Processions Law, passed five years ago, an end has been put to the noisy parades and processions, with bands of music and rabble following, which previously had become so serious an evil. The Sunday-theatre law is thoroughly enforced, attempts at evading it receiving the prompt attention of the police, when brought to their notice. German theatrical companies perform in Newark and other places on Sunday evening, because, as

they say in their advertisements, they are excluded by law from performing in New York.*

The United States had the attention and commanded the respect of the world when they closed the Centennial Exhibition on Sundays.

Lift an Archipelago above the sea, and it is no longer a set of separate islands, but a single mass of firm land. Lift the warring interests of classes out of the sea of selfishness, and the solidity of society is secured. In Mrs. Stowe's "Poganuc People" class prejudices fade out of New England towns only during a religious revival. I have seen factory proprietors, managers, and operatives sitting side by side on the floor in the same aisle in an overcrowded church, and singing psalms from the same book, when a few weeks previously they had been almost ready to draw knives and use them on each other's throats.

What is the proof of the Divine appointment of the Lord's Day?

(1.) The reinstitution by the Sermon on the Mount of the moral spirit of the whole Decalogue. This is the vital point. It is plain that certain of the commands of the Decalogue are reinstituted by the Sermon on the Mount; as, for example, the commands as to murder, theft, adultery. But "not one jot or tittle shall in anywise pass from the law." Evidently, the Decalogue is intended by this language. The whole scope of the Sermon on the Mount shows that the moral spirit of the whole Decalogue is reinstituted. This is as true of the fourth commandment as of the fifth, sixth, or seventh. What is the moral spirit of the fourth commandment? The duty of observing one day in seven as a period of rest and religious culture. It is not important that the day of the Jewish Sabbath be observed. The first day of the Jewish week commemorates the resurrection and is the one day in seven observed by the apostles. If it is asked, therefore, how the fourth commandment can be applied to the Lord's Day, the reply is that the Sermon on the Mount reinstates the moral spirit of the whole Decalogue, and that the teaching and example of the apostles and our Lord substituted for the seventh the first day of the week, and this as the Lord's Day, in commemoration of the Resurrection.

(2.) The fourth commandment and the reason attached to it.

(3.) The accordance of the appointment of Sunday with the physical and moral constitution of man.†

---

* See the *Illustrated Christian Weekly*, Dec. 21st, 1878, and reports of the New York Sabbath Committee.

† See Hessey, "Bampton Lectures on the Sabbath," for the arguments in detail supporting standard views on this topic.

You say you will take care of America without Sunday. You have not been able to keep her in order with Sunday. You say that men cannot be made moral by legislation. They can be made immoral by the want of it, and by the consequent presence of temptation. You say that the Parisian Sunday would be better for our work — the great factories, the industries of the land — than the New England Sunday. Well, I have heard that after a Continental Sunday comes a Continental blue Monday, and that it is very common in France and Germany, and even in England, among the lower class of operatives, for Monday to be an idle day, on account of the necessity of obtaining recuperation after the dissipations of Sunday. Let us have the Parisian or Continental Sunday, and our trades will have the Continental unproductive Monday. "Operatives are perfectly right," said John Stuart Mill, "in thinking that if all worked on Sunday seven days' work would be given for six days' wages." Manufacturers abroad often affirm that American operatives can well demand higher prices than the Continental, because they are not incapacitated on Monday by the necessity of getting rid of the effects of Sunday's dissipation. Only the Sunday rightly used makes Monday elastic. Coleridge said that God gives civilization in its Sundays fifty-two springs a year. Your operative, your horse, under the law against cruelty to animals, deserves his seventh portion of time for rest. Two drovers started from Ohio together. One drove Sundays, the other did not; and the one who did not drove seventeen miles every Monday, passed the other in a fortnight, reached Philadelphia first, and was two days ahead in the market. I might cite hundreds of similar cases to show why it is now conceded by physicians and managers of industry that the rest ordained of God is the source of industrial vigour.

I hold that when our fathers on Clark Island yonder rested their first Sabbath Day they were setting a good example, not only for the Church, but for the factories and railways and every industrial establishment of America. Until we have enough of their spirit to enable us to keep the Day of Rest without any substantial infraction, we shall not be safe in this country, as our fathers were safe, without bolted doors. There are many gray-haired men here to-day; and if some of them were born in New England, they have slept in houses with unbolted doors in the country-side of New England fifty years ago. I read not long since, in a brilliant paper by a New England public man, the statement that in his boyhood he used to go to sleep with the front door in his father's house open; and this was in the Connecticut Valley, where the tramps annoy the farms occasionally

to-day. You wish to restore to public life that sweet security and to industrial life that peace that filled New England when she had a Sabbath worthy the name. I look back to the moonlight dropping through the open doors of New England country homes in the midnights of fifty and eighty years ago, and find in that unsuspicious radiance and in the religious culture, the united citizenship, the theocratic brotherhood which lay beneath it, the pillar of fire, and the only pillar of fire, that can lead us out of communism and socialism and the political dangers of universal suffrage.

ALCOHOL AND THE HUMAN BRAIN.

[An address was made by Dr. Harriman previous to his exhibition of the blood corpuscles of inebriates as magnified by his powerful microscope. After a brief introduction, he gave the following interesting facts :

The domains of the animal, geological, and vegetable kingdoms were long shrouded in such darkness as precluded any certain knowledge respecting them. The microscope had wonderfully dispelled the darkness, and spread a light so clear that we could trace in Nature's most minute design the signature and stamp of power divine. He gave an interesting account of blood in man and animals.

The pretubercular stage in consumption could be told by the aid of the microscope. Professor P. F. Reinsch's recent discoveries of petrified protoplasm and petrified protoplastic plants, algæ, the first formations in quartz rock, were noticed. That alcohol produced morphological changes in the blood was ably demonstrated.

1. It acts specifically upon the colouring matter in the red blood corpuscles, causing them in many instances to be colourless, or the colouring matter may settle in one portion of the globule.

2. The red blood corpuscles become distorted and shrunken, and in some cases completely broken up.

3. It drives out the colouring matter, which settles in fine pigment granules in other morphological elements of the blood and in the edges of the white corpuscle.

4. It produces a parasite vegetation in the fluid of the blood, and hydro-carbon substances can readily be detected with the high power of the microscope ; also fine granular pigments can be seen with proper magnifying power in the tissues of the body, causing purple red streaks that are sometimes seen without any microscope.

After his address Dr. Harriman threw upon a large screen the magnified corpuscles of healthy blood, and also of the blood of inebriates. It was a very striking exhibition. In the presentation of healthy blood the corpuscles stood out upon the screen clear, round and well-defined. The blood of the inebriate, as magnified by the Doctor, presented corpuscles that were shrunken, distorted, irregular in outline, with and without colouring matter, and with here and there growing from them a fungoid filament, that is most striking in its character. Spores, and dark granular pigments were also numerous in the fluid of the blood. There was no mistaking the difference between the diseased and the healthy blood. It was a rare and very striking exhibition, and showed how important an agent the microscope may become in the detection of human disease. Dr. Harriman deserves great credit for the clear and intelligent manner in which a most interesting subject was presented to the audience.]

Prelude.—Science in the International Sabbath-School Lessons.

Only a few flaming lightnings of God's natural Sinai have been thrown into this darkened air; but these vivid views of blood discs in health and in disease hush us with awe! Why should not the flashing of this electricity be brought sometimes before the Church in God's name, and especially before the young in the Sabbath-schools ? A theological quarterly of the highest reputation lately had an article defending the proposal that an illustrated pulpit be introduced among the new agencies for promoting religious knowledge. I am not about to recommend an innovation so startling, although I might do so and take protection under the shadow of many a reverend modern name, and especially under the authority of the great days when art spoke religiously in the pictures and carved stone of

cathedrals. In one of his illustrated lectures on geology, President Hitchcock said: "Before the close of this century pictures will be as much used in the preaching of sermons as are manuscripts."*

Ought not the young countenance to be brought face to face with God's penalties on intemperance, and sensuality, and gluttony, and the whole range of bodily vices? It must have been that the soft snows of winter were falling on my sixth or seventh year when I first saw, in a district school-house in the holy country side, Dr. Sewall's famous engravings illustrating the effects of intemperance upon the coats of the stomach. I remember how I sat swinging my feet on the front benches, with the other little boys, and how I stared at the strange gentleman with the coloured plates. He put up before the school first an illustration of the inner surface of the stomach in a healthy state. It was in colour slightly reddish, tinged with yellow. At its side was placed an illustration of the coats of the stomach of a moderate drinker. The blood-vessels stood out plainly and were inflamed and enlarged. We could not see them at all in the healthy stomach. Flashes of physical excitement had shot flashes of diseased colour through the thin, delicate membranes. Next came the representation of the coats of the stomach of the habitual drunkard. Here were swollen, bloody, knotted veins, permanently inflamed and enlarged. Interspersed among them were several blue spots, looking like the result of poison and similar to the rum-blossoms sometimes seen on the drunkard's face. In another plate we looked on a cancerous stomach with its creeping, crawling, quirling ulcer spots. The picture of the coats of the stomach of a distinguished man who died of *delirium tremens* represented them as covered with a dark brown flaky substance, like black vomit, dropping off the walls in the process of ulceration, in the round, putrid sores in the interior of this citadel of life. I went home chilled by the ghastly vision, and told my parents what I had seen, and from that time to this everything concerning the relation of science to intemperance has been of interest to me. In the enlargement of Sabbath-school instruction there is room for the illumination of both Ebal and Gerizim by the light of the freshest researches of science.

Now that we have appointed professorships in our theological seminaries on the relations between Religion and Science, it is high time for the Sabbath schools to bring themselves up abreast of the latest investigations. Many of our churches have put into certain of their Sabbath classes compact text-books summarizing the laws of health, and inculcating upon the young the wisdom of the best experts concerning temperance.

The most effective international society of our time is the Sabbath-school. As an antidote to Socialism and many other modern diseases, there is nothing more priceless than the union of the young people of all lands under the moulding hands of Christians worthy of the name and for the study of religious truth. The International Sabbath-school Lessons are weaving nations into unity and creating a spirit which practically makes one body of all Evangelical denominations. What I want is the word regeneration uttered early, as the commencement of the temperance reform, and uttered by the international power of the Church, so that the whisper of science on this theme may be heard around the globe. There are many ways of grasping a vine on a trellis-work. You may seize the tendril here, or the grape cluster there; but your better way is to lay hold of the vine by the trunk near the earth, if you would secure at once all its branches. There are three great words in the Temperance Reform: Legislation, Abstinence, Regeneration.

---

* "Bibliotheca Sacra," July, 1878, p. 569.

If I understand the theme at all, only he has hold of the trunk of the vine of reform who seizes upon personal regeneration as his central idea.

The church that does most for the child will have most influence with the family. Seize upon any corner of the web of society, and draw it out of its tangles, and you will ultimately draw out of tangles every part of the web of the world. But the corner from which the tangles unravel the most easily we call the child. The Sabbath-school is the grappling-hook between the loyal under the Supreme Theocracy and the disloyal. I should be able to expel Socialism from the world if I could bring men and women at large in society into God's house every Sunday, and persuade them to give up their wills to God in total self-surrender. The short way out of Socialism is through Nazareth.

I hope the day will come when we shall have only one postal stamp for the whole world. It is twenty-five years to-day since the first company was formed to lay an ocean cable. Russia, Great Britain, France, Spain, Italy, Greece, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Prussia, are all united at this moment in a postal union. They are united also in a telegraphic union; and there is already clamour for a uniform system of weights and measures among all civilized nations. We begin to have proposals for the issuing of a postage stamp in the United States that will go to China and Russia, Italy and Greece, as well as to any part of our own land. These results would have surprised Cæsar; but the international study of religious truth is a yet more sublime achievement. How would it have added to the enthusiasm even of a Paul, when he went out of the Ostian gate to die, if he could have seen ten thousand times ten thousand in all nations and tribes and kindreds and tongues, sitting down every Sabbath day to the same lesson, and at the Cape of Good Hope, and at the edge of the Yellow Sea, and in the Sandwich Islands, in Germany and in France and in Italy, and on these once desolate shores uniting to study the same Book! The child is the future. Show the children Sinai; show the children both the revealed and the natural divine laws; show the children Calvary; let them bow down in total self-surrender before God, as both Redeemer and Lord, and withtheir hands locked internationally as now, He will bring the whole planet out of socialism, out of communism, out of intemperance, out of sensuality, and so near His own heart, that the beating of His pulses will become the marching song of the ages.

The Lecture.

Cassio's language in "Othello" is to-day adopted by cool physiological science. "O God! that men should put an enemy in their mouths to steal away their brains! That we should with joy, revel, pleasure, and applause transform ourselves into beasts! To be now a sensible man, by-and-by a fool, and presently a beast! Oh! strange! Every inordinate cup is unblessed and the ingredient is a devil." *

Central in all discussion of the influence of intoxicating drink upon the human brain is the fact that albuminous substances are hardened by alcohol. I take the white of an egg, and as you see, turn it out in a fluid condition into a goblet. The liquid is a viscous, glue-

* Shakespeare, "Othello," act ii. scene 3.

like substance, largely composed of albumen. It is made up of pretty nearly the same chemical ingredients that constitute a large part of the brain and the nervous system, and of many other tissues of the body. Forty per cent. of the matter in the corpuscles of the blood is albumen. I am about to drench this white of an egg with alcohol. I have never performed this experiment before and it may not succeed; but so certain am I that it will that I purpose never to put bottle to my lips and introduce into my system a fiend to steal away my brains. Edmund Burke, when he heard William Pitt say in Parliament that England would stand till the day of judgment, rose and replied: "What I fear is the day of *no* judgment." When Booth was about to assassinate Lincoln, his courage failed him, and he rushed away from the theatre for an instant into the nearest restaurant and called for brandy. Harden the brain by drenching it in alcohol and you harden the moral nature.

If you will fasten your attention on the single fact that alcohol hardens this albuminous substance with which I place it in contact, you will have in that single strategic circumstance an explanation of most of its ravages upon the blood and nerves and brain. I beg you to notice that the white of an egg in the goblet does not become hardened by exposure to the air. I have allowed it to remain exposed for a time, in order that you may see that there is no legerdemain in this experiment. I now pour alcohol upon this albuminous fluid, and, if the result here is what it has been in other cases, I shall pretty soon be able to show you a very good example of what coagulated albumen is in the nervous system and blood corpuscles. You will find this white of an egg gradually so hardened that you can take it out without a fork. I notice already that a mysterious change in it has begun. A strange thickening shoots through the fluid mass. This is your moderate drunkard that I am stirring up now. There is your tippler, a piece of him [holding up a portion of the coagulated mass upon the glass pestle]. The coagulation of the substance of the brain and of the nervous system goes on. I am stirring up a hard drinker now. The infinitely subtle laws of chemistry take their course. Here is a man [holding up a large part of the coagulated mass] whose brain is so leathery that he is a beast and kicks his wife to death. I am stirring up in this goblet now the brain of a hardened sot. On this prongless glass rod I hold up a large part of the white of an egg which you saw poured into this glass as a fluid. Here is your man [holding up a larger mass] who has benumbed his conscience and his reason both, and has begun to be dangerous to society from the effects of a diseased brain. Wherever alcohol touches this albuminous substance it hardens it,

and it does so by absorbing and fixing the water it contains. I dip out of the goblet now your man in delirium tremens. Here is what was once a fluid, rolling easily to right and left; and now you have the leathery brain and the hard heart.

Distortions of blood discs taken from the veins of drunkards have been shown to you here by the stereopticon and the best microscope in the United States. All the amazing alterations you saw in the shape, colour, and contents of the blood discs are produced by the affinity of alcohol for the water in the albuminous portion of the globules.

I am speaking here in the presence of expert chemists. You say I have no business to know anything about these topics. Well, the new professor in Andover on the relations between religion and science has no business to know them. The new professor at Edinburgh University and in Princeton has no business to know them. The lectureship at the Union Theological Seminary in New York has no right to teach on these themes. There is getting to be a tolerably large company of us who are intending to look into these matters at the point of the microscope and the scalpel. In a wiser generation than ours the haughty men who will not speak themselves of the relations of religion and science, and will not allow others to speak—veritable dogs in the manger—will be turned as dogs out of the manger. I speak very strongly, for I have an indignation that cannot be expressed when it is said that men who join hands with physicians, and are surrounded by experts to teach them the facts, have no right to make inferences. Men educated and put into professorships to discuss as a specialty the relation of religion and science have no right to discuss these themes! We have a right as lawyers to discuss such topics before juries, when we bring experts in to help us. I bring experts before you as a jury. I assert the right of Andover, and Princeton, and New Haven, and Edinburgh, and even of this humble platform, to tell you what God does in the brain, and to exhibit to you the freshest discoveries there of both His mercy and wrath.

My support of temperance reform I would base upon the following propositions: –

1. Scars in the flesh do not wash out nor grow out; but, in spite of the change of all the particles of the body, are accurately reproduced, without alteration, by the flux of its particles.

Let us begin with an incontrovertible proposition. Everybody knows that the scars of childhood are retained through life and that we are buried with them. But we carry into the grave no particle of the flesh that we had in youth. All the particles of the body are

in flux and are changed every few years. There is, however, something in us that persists. I am I; and, therefore, I am praiseworthy or blameworthy for things I did a score of years since, although there is not a particle of my body here now that was here then. The sense of identity, persisting in all the flux of the particles of the system, proves there is something else in man besides matter. This is a very unsubstantial consideration, you say; but the acute and profound German finds in this one fact of the per sistence of the sense of identity, in spite of the flux of the particles of the body, the proof of the separateness of matter and mind.

Something reproduces these scars as the system throws off and changes its particles. That something must have been affected by the scarring. There is a strange connection between scars and the immaterial portion of us. It is a mysterious fact, right before us daily, and absolutely incontrovertible, that something in that part of us which does not change reproduces these scars. Newton, when the apple fell on his head—according to the fable, for I suppose that story is not history—found in it the law of the universe; and so in the simple fact that scars will not grow out or wash out, although the particles of the flesh are all changed, we find two colossal propositions. The one is that there is somewhat in us that does not change, and is not matter; the other is that this somewhat is connected mysteriously with the inerasibility of scars, which, therefore, may be said to exist in some sense in the spiritual as well as in the material substance of which we are made.

2. It is as true of scars on the brain and nervous system as of those on any less important parts of the body, that they will not wash out nor grow out.

3. Scars on the brain or nervous system may be made by physical or mental habits, and are the bases of the self-propagative power of habits.

4. When the scars or grooves in which a habit runs are made deep, the habit becomes automatic or self-acting and perhaps involuntary.

5. The grooves worn or scars made by good and bad habits may be inherited.

Physical identity of parent and offspring, spiritual identity of parent and offspring—these mysteries we have discussed here; and this two-fold identity is concerned in the transmission of the thirst for drink. When the drunkard who has had an inflamed stomach is the father of a child that brings into the world with it an inflamed stomach, you have a case of the transmission of alcoholic scars.

6. While self-control lasts, a bad habit is a vice; when self-control is lost, a bad habit is a disease.

7. When a bad habit becomes a disease, the treatment of it belongs to physicians; while it is a vice, the treatment of it belongs to the Church.

8. In probably nine cases out of ten among the physical difficulties produced by the use of alcohol, and not inherited, the trouble is a vice, and not a disease.

9. Alcohol, by its affinity for water, hardens all the albuminous or glue-like substances in the body.

10. It thus paralyzes the small nerves, produces arterial relaxation, and deranges the circulation of the blood.

11. It produces thus an increased quickness in the beating of the heart, and a ruddiness of countenance, which are not signs of health, but of disease.

Pardon me if I dwell a moment on this proposition, which was not made clear by science until a few years ago. You say that moderate drinking quickens the pulse and adds ruddiness to the countenance, and that, therefore, you have some reason to believe that it is a source of health. I can hardly pardon myself for not having here a set of the chemical substances that partially paralyze the small nerves. I have a list of them before me, and it includes ether and the whole series of nitrates, and especially the nitrate of amyl. If I had the latter substance here, I might, by lifting it to the nostrils, produce this flushing of the face that you call a sign of health in moderate drinking. There are five or six chemical agents that produce paralysis of the vessels of the minute circulation, and among them is alcohol. A blush is produced by a slight paralysis of the small nerves in the interlacing ends of the arteries and veins. If I had ether here, and could turn it out on the back of my hand and evaporate it, I could partially freeze the skin; and then, removing the ether, you would see a blush come to the back of the hand. That is because the little nerves, that help to constrict and keep up the proper tone of the circulating organs, are temporarily paralyzed. A permanent blush in the face of a drunkard indicates a permanent injury to the blood-vessels by alcohol. The varicose vein is often produced in this way, by the paralysis of some of the nerves that are connected with the fine parts of the circulatory organs. When the face blushes permanently in the drunkard the injury revealed is not a local one, but is inflicted on every organ throughout the whole system.

After moderate drinking, you feel the heart beating faster, to be sure; but it beats more rapidly because of the paralysis of the deli-

cate nerves connected with the arteries, and because of the consequent arterial relaxation. The blood meets with less resistance in passing through the relaxed circulatory organs, and so, with no additional force in the heart, that organ beats more rapidly. It beats faster simply because it has less force to overcome. The quickened pulse is a proof of disease, and not of health. *

12. Alcohol injures the blood by changing the colour and chemical composition of its corpuscles.

In the stereopticon illustrations you saw that the red discs of blood are distorted in shape by the action of alcohol. You saw that the arrangement of the colouring matter in the red discs was changed. You saw that various adulterations appeared to come into the blood, or, at least, into visibility there, under the influence of alcohol. Lastly, you saw, most terrible of all, an absolutely new growth occurring there —a sprout protruding itself from the side of the red corpuscle in the vital stream. Last year I showed you what some of the diseases of leprosy did for the blood ; and you see how closely alcoholism in the blood resembles in physical effects the most terrific diseases known to man.

Here are the diseases that are the great red seal of God Almighty's wrath against sensuality; and when we apply the microscope to them, we find in the blood discs these sprouts, that greatly resemble each other in the inebriate and in the leper. Dr. Harriman has explained, with the authority of an expert, these ghastly growths. These sprouts shoot out of the red discs, and he tells you that, after having been called before jury after jury as an expert, sometimes in cases where life was at stake, he has studied alcoholized blood, and that a certain kind of spore, a peculiar sort of sprout, which you have seen here, he never saw except in the veins of a confirmed drunkard. I think the day is coming when by microscopical examination of the blood discs we can tell what disease a man has inherited or acquired, if it be one of that kind which takes hold of the circu latory fluid.

This alcohol, with its affinity for water, changes the composition of every substance in the body into which water enters, and there are seven hundred and ninety parts of water in every thousand of blood. The reason alcohol changed this white of an egg into such hardness that if it had been put in whole I could have rolled it across the platform, was that the fierce spirit took the water out of the albumen. If I had a plate of glass here, and could put upon it a solution of the white of an egg, and could sprinkle upon it a little

* See Dr. Richardson, "Cantor Lectures on Alcohol."

finely-powered caustic soda, I could very soon pick up the sheet of gelatinous substance, and should find it leathery, elastic, tough. Just so this marvellous white matter folded in sheets in the brain is drenched with a substance that takes out the water; and the effect on the brain is to destroy its capacity to perform some of its most delicate actions. The results of that physical incapacity are illustrated in all the proverbial effects of intemperance.

13. The deteriorations produced in the blood by alcohol are peculiarly injurious to the brain, on account of the great quantity of blood sent to that organ.

The brain weighs only about one twenty-eighth of the rest of the body; and yet into it, according to most authorities, is sent from a tenth to a sixth of all the blood. If you adopt fiat money, where will the most harm be done? What part of this land shows first of all the effect of a debased condition of the currency? Wall Street. Why? Because there the circulation is most vigorous. The blood of the land, to speak of money under that title, is thrown into Wall Street, as the blood of the body is thrown into the head, and so in Wall Street we have our men on the watch to tell us whether the currency is in a healthy or unhealthy state. The slightest alteration is felt there, because the currency there is accumulated; and so in the brain the slightest injury of the blood is felt first, because here is accumulated the currency of the system.

14. Most poisons and medicines act in the human system according to a law of local affinity by which their chief force is expended on particular organs, and sometimes on particular spots of particular organs.

15. All science is agreed that the local affinity of alcohol—like that of opium, prussic acid, hasheesh, belladonna, etc. – is for the brain.

16. The brain is the organ of the mind, and the temple and instrument of conduct and character.

17. Whatever disorganizes brain disorganizes mind and character, and whatever disorganizes mind and character disorganizes society.

18. The local affinity of alcohol for the brain, therefore, exempts it, in its relations to government, from the list of articles that have no such affinity; and gives to government the right, in self-defence, to interfere by the prohibitory regulation of its sale as a beverage.

19. It is not sufficient to prove that alcohol is not a poison to overthrow the scientific basis of its prohibitory laws.

20. Intemperance and cerebral injury are so related that even moderate indulgence is inseparably connected with intellectual and moral disintonement.

21. In this circumstance, and in the inerasibility of the scars pro-

duced by the local affinity of alcohol for the brain, the principle of total abstinence finds its justification by science.

Nothing in science is less questioned than the law of local affinities by which different substances taken into the system exert their chief effect at particular localities. Lead, for example, fastens first upon the muscles of the wrist, producing what is known among painters and white-lead manufacturers as a wrist-drop. Manganese seizes upon the liver, iodine upon the lymphatic glands, chromate of potash upon the lining membrane of the eyelids, mercury upon the salivary glands and mouth. Oil of tobacco paralyzes the heart. Arsenic inflames the mucous membranes of the alimentary passages. Strychnine takes effect upon the spinal cord. Now, as all chemists admit, the local affinity of alcohol is for the brain. Dr. Lewis describes a case in which the alcohol could not be detected in the fluid of the brain cavities, nor, indeed, in any part of the body; but was obtained by distillation from the substance of the brain itself. Dr. Percy distilled alcohol in large quantities from the substance of the brains of animals killed by it, when only small quantities could be found in the blood or other parts of the systems of the same animals. Dr. Kirk mentions a case in which the brain liquid of a man who died in intoxication smelt very strongly of whiskey, and when some of it was taken in a spoon and a candle put beneath it the flame burned with a lambent blue flame. But brain is the organ of the mind. Dr. Bucknill* quotes Forbes Winslow as having testified before a committee of Parliament that the liquid dipped from the brain of an habitual inebriate can thus be burned. Whatever is a disorganizer of the brain is a disorganizer of mind; and whatever is a disorganizer of mind is a disorganizer of society. It is from this point of view that the right of government to prevent the manufacture of madmen and paupers can be best seen. I care not what men make of the famous recent experiments of Lallemand, Perrin, and Duroy, of France, by which half of the medical profession, including Dr. Carpenter, has been carried over to the support of the propositions that alcohol is eliminated from the system in totality and in nature; is never transformed and never destroyed in the organism; is not food; and is essentially a poison. I care not, on the other hand, what men make of the proposition Mr. Lewes defends, that alcohol may be a negative food. The local affinity of alcohol for the brain! This is a great fact. It is a fact uncontroverted. It is a fact sufficient. It is a fact to be heeded even in legislation.

Among the well-known authorities on the influence of alcohol on

* "Habitual Drinking."

the human brain, Dr. W. B. Carpenter and Dr. B. W. Richardson, of England, are now in entire accord with Prof. Youmans and Dr. W. E. Greenfield, of the United States, in recommending total abstinence. Dr. Richardson's Cantor lectures have been followed by a volume on "Total Abstinence," and he gives to Dr. Carpenter's views on this subject his full assent and final adhesion, having learned at last, he says, "how solemnly right they are." In 1869 Dr. Richardson began to abstain from wine by limiting his use of it to festal occasions; but still more recently he has abandoned its use altogether.

The graduates of Amherst College met at the Parker House in Boston some years ago, and, although a wine-glass was placed at the side of each plate, not one of them was filled. Niagara itself, a recent traveller in the United States says, is not as worthy of description to Englishmen as the pure array of goblets with ice-water at the usual dinners at hotels. Mr. Hayes has expelled intoxicating beverages from the Presidential mansion.

The latest investigators of the influence of alcohol on the brain are Schulinus, Anstie, Dupré, Subbotin, and Binz. The latter, in a series of remarkable articles, published in the *Practitioner* in 1876, maintains that a portion of every dose of alcohol is burned in the system; and yet he considers the use of alcohol in health as entirely superfluous. The experimenters agree with the majority of physicians that in the army and navy, and for use among healthy persons, alcohol, even as a ration, strictly limited to a moderate quantity, is physiologically useless and generally harmful.

Upon different portions of the brain the action of alcohol can be distinctly traced by medical science, and even by common observation. The brain, it will be remembered, is divided into three parts, the upper, which comprises the larger part, and which is supposed to be the seat of the intellectual and moral faculties, is called the *cerebrum*. Below that, in the back part of the organ, is another mass, called the *cerebellum*, parts of which are believed to control the contractions of the muscles in portions of the body. Still lower is the *medulla oblongata*, which presides over the nerves of respiration. Now, the action of alcohol can be distinctly marked upon the different parts of the brain. The moral and intellectual faculties are first jarred out of order in the progress of intoxication. The tippler laughs and sings, is talkative and jocose, coarse or eloquent to almost any degree, according to his temperament. The *cerebrum* is first affected. His judgment becomes weak. He is incapable of making a good bargain or of defending his own rights intelligently; but he does not yet stagger. He is as yet only a moderate drinker. The effect of moderate drinking, however, is to weaken the judgment and

to destroy the best powers of the will and intellect. But he takes another glass, and the *cerebellum*, which governs several of the motions of the body, is affected, and now he begins to stagger. He loses all the control of his muscles and plunges headlong against post and pavement. One more glass, and the *medulla oblongata* is poisoned. This organ controls the nerves which order the movements of the lungs, and now occurs that hard breathing and snoring which is seen in dead drunkenness. This stoppage is caused by impure blood so poisoning the *medulla oblongata* that it can no longer perform its duties. The *cerebrum* and *cerebellum* now seem to have their action entirely suspended, and sometimes the respiratory movements stop for ever and the man dies by asphyxia, in the same manner as by drowning, strangling, or narcotic poisoning by any other substance. *

Who shall say where end the consequences of alcoholic injury of the blood and of the substance of the brain? Here within the cranium, in this narrow chamber, so small that a man's hand may span it, and upon this sheet of cerebral matter, which if dilated out would not cover a surface of over six hundred square inches, is the point of union between spirit and matter. Inversions of right judgment and every distortion of moral sense legitimately follow from the intoxicating cup. It is here that we should speak decidedly of the influence of moderate drinking, Men may theorize as they please; but practically there is in average experience no such thing as a moderate dose of alcohol. People drink it to produce an effect. They take enough to "fire-up," as they say; and unless that effect is produced they are not satisfied. They will have enough to raise their spirits or dissipate gloom. And this is enough to impair judgment, and in the course of years perhaps to ruin fortune, body, and soul. The compass is out of line in life's dangerous sea, and a few storms may bring the ship upon breakers.

It is to be remembered that by the law of local affinity the dose of alcohol is not diffused throughout the system; but is concentrated in its chief effects upon a single organ. When a man drinks moderately, though the effects might be minute if dispersed through the whole body, yet they may be powerful when most of them are gathered upon the brain. They may be dangerous when turned upon the intellect, and even fatal when concentrated upon the primal guiding powers of mind—reason and moral sense. It is not to the whole body that a moderate glass goes. It is chiefly to the most important part—the brain; and not to the whole brain, but to its

* See Prof. Ferrier, "The Localization of Cerebral Disease," London, 1878.

most important part—the seat of the higher mental and moral powers; and not to these powers at large, but to their helmsman and captain — Reason and Conscience.

"Ship ahoy! All aboard! Let your one shot come," shouts the sailor to the pirate craft. Now one shot will not shiver a big ship's timbers much; but suppose that this one ball were to strike the captain through the heart and the helmsman through the skull, and that there are none to fill their posts, it would be a terrible shot indeed. Moderate drinking is a charmed ball from a pirate craft. It does not lodge in the beams' ends. It cuts no masts. It shivers no plank between wind and water. It strikes no sailor or under officer; but with magic course it seeks the heart of the captain and the arms of the helmsman, and it always hits. Their leaders dead, and none to take their place, the crew are powerless against the enemy. Thunders another broadside from pirate Alcohol, and what is the effect? Every ball is charmed; not one of the crew is killed, but every one becomes mad and raises mutiny. Commanders dead, they are free. Thunders another broadside from the pirate, and the charmed balls complete their work. The mutinous crew rage with insanity. Captain Conscience and Steersman Reason are picked up, and, lest their corpses should offend the crazy sailors, pitched overboard. Then rages Jack Lust from one end of the ship to the other. That brave tar, Midshipman Courage, who in his right mind was the bravest defender of the ship, now wheels the cannon against his own friends, and rakes the deck with red-hot grape until every mast totters with shot-holes. The careful stewards, seamen Friendship and Parental Love, whose exertions have always heretofore provided the crew seasonably with food and drink, now refuse to cook, furnish no meals, unhead the water-casks, waste the provisions, and break the ship's crockery. The vessel has wheeled into the trough of the sea; a black shadow approaches swiftly over the waters, and the compass and helm are deserted. That speculating Mate, Love of Money, who, if sober, would see the danger and order every rag down, from jib to mainsail, and make the ship scud under bare poles before the black squall, now, on the contrary, orders up every sail and spreads every thread of canvas. The rising storm whistles in the rigging: but he does not hear it. That black shadow on the water is swiftly nearing. He does not see it. In the trough of the sea the ship rocks like a cockle-shell. He does not feel it. Yonder before the dense rush of the coming blow of air rises a huge wave, foaming and gnawing and groaning on high. He does not hear it. With a shock like the opening of an earthquake it strikes the broadside; with a roar it washes over the deck; three snaps like cannon, and the heavily-

rigged masts are gone; a lurch and sucking in of waves, and the hold is full of water, and the sinking ship just survives the first heavy sea. Then comes out Mirthfulness and sits astride the broken bowsprit and ogles a dancing tune. The crew dance! It were possible even yet to so man the pumps and right the helm as to ride over the swells and drive into port; but all action for the right government of the ship is ended. Trumpeter Language mounts the shattered beams of the forecastle and makes an oration. It is not necessary to work, he tells the crew; but to hear him sputter yarns.

It is fearful now to look upon the raging of the black sea. Every moment the storm increases in fury. As a giant would toss about a straw, so the waves handle the wrecked timbers. Night gathers her blackness into the rifted clouds and the strong moaning sound of the storm is heard on the dark ocean. By that glare of lightning I saw a sail and a life-boat! Men from another ship are risking their lives to save the insane crew whose masts are gone. They come nearer; but the boat bounds and quivers, and is nearly swamped upon the top of a wave. Jack Courage and Independence see the boat coming. "Ship ahoy!" shout the deliverers. "Life-boat from the ship Temperance. Quit your wreck and be saved." No reply. Independence grinds his teeth and growls to Jack Courage that the offer of help is an insult. "I will tell you how to answer," says Jack, stern and bloody. There is one cannon with a dry charge. They wheel that upon the approaching boat, and Independence holds the linstock over the fuse-hole. "Life-boat for sailors on the wreck," shouts Philanthropy from the approaching boat. "What answer, ship Immortal?" Then shoots from the ringing gun a tongue of flame, and ten pounds of iron are on their way. The Temperance boat rocks lower from the wave-top, and the deadly reply just grazes the heads of the astounded philanthropists and buries itself heavily in their own ship beyond. It was an accident, they think, and keep on, board the ship and stand upon its deck. Then flash from their scabbards a dozen swords; then click the locks of a dozen muskets; then double the palms of a dozen fists; then shake the clubs of a dozen maniac arms; and the unsuspecting deliverers are murdered on the deck they came to save. As the lightning glares, I see them thrown into the sea, while thunders are the dirge of the dead and the damnation of the murderers.

The drunken ship is fast filling with water. Not a man at the pumps, not an arm at the helm. Having destroyed their friends, the crew fall upon each other. Close under their bow rave the breakers of a rocky shore; but they hear it not. At intervals they seem to realize their condition, and their power even yet to save themselves;

but they make no effort. Gloom and storm and foam shut them up against hell with many thunders. In this terrible extremity Independence is heard to refuse help and boasts of his strength. Friendship and Parental Love rail at thoughts of affection. Language trumpets his easy yarns and grows garrulous as the timbers crack one after another. Rage and Revenge are now the true names of Firmness and Courage. Silly Mirth yet giggles a dance, and I saw him astride the last timber, as the ship went down, tossing foam at the lightning. Then came a sigh of the storm, a groaning of waves, a booming of blackness, and a red, crooked thunderbolt shot wrathfully blue into the suck of the sea where the ship went down.

And I ask the names of those rocks, and was told : God's stern and immutable laws.

And I asked the name of that ship, and they said : Immortal Soul.

And I asked why its crew brought it there, and they said : Their Captain Conscience and Helmsman Reason were dead.

And I asked how they died, and they said : By one single shot from the Pirate Alcohol ; by one charmed ball of Moderate Drinking !

On this topic, over which we sleep, we shall some day cease to dream.

SOCIALISM, TEMPERANCE, AND WOMAN'S VOTE.

Prelude.—Romanism and High Schools.

Voltaire said of the English people what might be said of any large collection of human beings, that they are like a glass of beer—the top froth, the bottom dregs, the middle excellent. This, of course, is speech not likely to be popular under republican institutions; but America is old enough to hear the truth, that we have a fashion-hunting, self-styled upper class, which is froth; and in our great towns a stratum of society ignorant and unprincipled, and that is fitly enough typified by the dregs at the bottom of the cup. Opposition to high schools in the United States comes, as yet, chiefly from the froth and dregs; and not from the middle of the cup of our population. But up and down through the middle portion there begins to shoot a strange yeast, thrown into the liquid, as I think, by a foreign priesthood. If once that yeast shall connect itself with the upper froth and the lower dregs in such a way as to draw the two together and make cloudy the whole liquid; or if in other words, Caste, Penuriousness, and Jesuitism become allies and attack the common-school system, God only knows what may be the result in American civilization!

A Jesuit school history of the United States has lately been written by Hassard, the assistant editor of the *New York Tribune*. He is also the author of a life of Archbishop Hughes and of Pius IX. He was once the editor of the *Catholic World*. He was also one of the editors of the new "American Cyclopædia," which Professor Hitchcock says has been tampered with in all the passages it contains relating to Romanism. Hassard's school history, which I now hold in my hands, is published under the imprimatur of the Catholic Publication Society (9, Barclay Street, New York). The book closes with a chapter in which the statement is made that Catholics, at the opening of our national career, were only one in one hundred and twenty of the population; but that they are now one in six. In view of this rapid growth of the Romish Church, Bishop Spalding says, in his introduction to the volume, that "he who will do most to form the character of the Catholic youth of America will also have done most to mould the future of the American people." Turn Hassard's book over cursorily, and the illustrations show you that it is of Jesuit origin. Here are pictures with Romish emblems in them; and, when you look into the book, you find our Puritan Fathers treated with not a little scorn, and many misstatements of a grave character made concerning them, and everywhere the Jesuit Fathers eulogized as if they were the founders of America.*

This "Jesuit School History of the United States" is only one of a series of young Catholics' text-books which I find advertised in the Catholic "Year Book."† Here are seven illustrated readers, as to which we are assured that "The 'Young Catholics' Series of Readers' is thoroughly Catholic in all its lessons." We have here also Catholic spellers and even Catholic arithmetics. I do not know what expurgations Jesuits propose to make in the multiplication table. Of course, there are Catholic historical catechisms, and here are four school-books on

---

* Compare pp. 57, 67, 83, 101, 104. 130, 244, 306, and 377.

† Sadlier's "Catholic Directory, Almanac, and Ordo for 1879," p. 24. D. & J. Sadlier & Co., 31, Barclay Street, New York.

"Ancient and Modern History," every one of them adapted from the French of Father Gazeau.

In its Ecclesiastical Summary for 1879 the "Catholic Directory" tells us that in the United States in the Catholic Church there are 11 archbishops, 52 bishops, 5,750 priests, 5,589 churches, 2,183 chapels and stations, 23 theological seminaries, 1,155 ecclesiastical students, 78 colleges, 577 academies and select schools, 1,958 parish schools, 242 asylums, 103 hospitals, and a Catholic population of 6,375,630.

What is the attitude of this vast body of ecclesiastics toward the American common-school system? Precisely that of the Papal Syllabus. I do not assail the Romish laity; but the aim of the Romish priesthood, and especially of Jesuit educators, is to sow disaffection everywhere against all schools not under the predominant control of the Romish Church. At Pittsburgh, lately, the high school came near being abolished, through the influence of three Jesuits on the daily press of that city. All the Jesuits of America are under the control of one man at Washington. The Navy Department, in spite of its present Protestant head, is so filled with Romish officers that it is commonly called the Catholic Department. Italian Jesuits, driven out of Victor Emanuel's kingdom, planted themselves a few years ago in New Mexico. They have so controlled legislation there that lately a bill passed Congress annulling a Romish law in this territory. The vicar-general of New Mexico issued an official notice to the press urging editors not to favour the American common-schools. The vicar-general of Boston, in a public lecture in this city, March 12th, said: "The attitude of the Catholic Church toward the public schools of this country, so far as we can determine from"—what? From the necessities of the case? From American public sentiment? From constitutions adopted here by our own population? No. "The attitude of the Catholic Church, so far as we can determine from papal documents, the decrees of the Council of Baltimore, and the pastorals of several bishops, is one of non-approval of the system itself, of censure of the manner of conducting them that prevails in most places, and of solemn admonition to pastors and parents to guard against the dangers of faith and morals arising from frequenting them."* Father Phelan, of St. Louis, affirmed not long ago, with high ecclesiastical approval, that he would as soon send his children into a pest-house as into the public-schools.

When—moving as your outlook committee, and glad to act in that capacity—I go from side to side of the Mississippi Valley, and come back and make a report, in which I include Pittsburgh and Cincinnati, and St. Louis and Louisville, I am sometimes told by local editors, who travel little, that there is no great opposition to high schools among Romanists—in sight from Beacon Hill! I do not speak of Romanists at large; but of a foreign priesthood. The field of view I would keep before you is not New England; but the nation. Now and then even a Protestant religious paper opposes high schools in a local contest, and is apparently blind to the wider horizons of the national outlook. A religious denominational journal is much like a box turtle. It not only has not equal sensitiveness to its environment in every direction; but in several directions it has no sensitiveness at all to the signs of the times. You cannot get out of it the truth as to other denominations; and not always as to its own. The denominational editor who is merely such, needs to travel in order to fit himself to fill the position of an outlook committee. I am not assailing the whole religious press; for a part of that of Boston and New York is emphasizing vigorously the danger of the attack now making on the high schools in the United States. Face to face with the unnoticed signs of Romish conspiracy against the high schools, I find a part of the Protestant reli-

* Report in *Advertiser* of March 13th.

gious press fanning the disaffection of an ignorant portion of our population against these same institutions. I turn to that part of the religious press and say: "*Et tu Brute!*" The youth of the land are here stabbed, as Cæsar was, by a hand from which there was just expectation of succour.

The president of Colorado College issued March 15th a very significant circular on Jesuit educators in America; and here are a few of its incisive sentences: "The statement in the Boston Monday Lecture of Monday, February 24th, 1879, to the effect that there is a wide-spread and systematic opposition to American high schools on the part of foreign priests, is correct. In Colorado the Romanists are doing far more than all other Christian denominations. In their principal convent five-sevenths of the pupils are from Protestant families. They have made great strides in California, having five colleges for young men and two academies for young women, with a hundred and four papal professors, and numbering in 1876 more pupils by 1,000 than were enrolled in 1870 in all the Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Episcopal schools, military academies, state normal schools and the California University. The Jesuits are now planning systematically to gain political control in the Republic. The Papacy has always sought temporal, power; but the political scheming of the Jesuits has made them intolerable to civilized states. Even Brazil turned them out in 1874, and in the petty Romish states of Central America it was expressly stipulated in a treaty between Guatemala and San Salvador that the latter state should expel the Jesuits. Jesuitism is not Romanism. Protestants ought to gain the best Romanists by uncovering the plots of the Jesuits and building against them."*

It is no pleasure for me to call attention to this conspiracy; but it is my duty to do so, however much unpopularity I may incur. If it shall please Providence to show me the sand-lots and the shores of the Pacific, I shall have no greater delight than to act as your outlook committee at the Golden Gate. If it shall please Providence to show me Salt Lake City, and any evils there, I shall have no greater delight than to act, as I have for the last four years, as your studious flying scout. It is my fortune or misfortune to go up and down the land—I cannot avoid doing so in the work Providence puts upon me; and I see public men frequently. I meet many kinds of public authorities. And I believe the president of Colorado College is right when he calls public attention to this conspiracy in words which experience will justify in another half century in a manner that will awaken all the people. You will thank us, then, if you look back to our early warning on the topic; and you will curse us then, if you find that we were gagged by any fear of unpopularity.

My opinion is that primary education merely is not enough to prepare citizens for the duties of their career in the United States. President Eliot said, in New York, not long ago, that merely primary education never has saved a people from the political dangers of universal suffrage, and probably never will. When George Combe was in this city, he said that the education your Boston schools gave to the average citizens was only about enough to prepare them for the amount of political power the masses of the people have in Prussia and Austria. We must in some way give large numbers of the population an education such that they can intelligently direct their own training. I hold that a man who has not been through more than the primary school does not know how to select his own reading very profitably. Seven times out of ten he may mistake bad reading for good, and may easily be misled by plausible demagogues—not only in politics, but in religion. He may be misled in science itself, if he has not enough education to enable him to

* Circular of Colorado College, by President E. P. Tenney.

sift books and turn to the best leadership with some confidence that he has chosen right. The rich do not depend on the high schools. They can take advantage of our best endowed academies; they can pay for the very best instruction in private schools. But our great middle-class are moulded by the high-school system into sympathy with the best thought of the age and the best public leaders. If you break the link of good secondary education, there will be no connection between your best thought and the masses of the people. It will be exceedingly hard to make your best thinkers sympathize with the people, and yet more hard to make the people sympathize with your best thinkers. It is the glory of the American civilization that her secondary education brings into sympathy with each other the masses and the best trained minds; and when that sympathy ceases you will have opened a dyke, and through the gap God only knows what surges of salt and bitterness may burst across the land! I regard the high school, next to the church, as the chief barrier against communistic and socialistic inroads from the howling sea of an ignorant and unprincipled population. Give me the high-school, under generally Christian influences; give me good secondary education in the United States; give me developed thoughtfulness in the masses; and I have little fear from the inroads of Socialism and Communism. The Church will then be able to grapple with the difficulties that surround the theme. But if you allow the people to petrify under merely parochial schools, nobody can reach the masses of the population except the ecclesiastic, and he only the part of the mass that lies nearest to him. Give New England only the parochial Romish schools in her manufacturing populations, and in a century her factory towns will become a New Ireland. She is a New Ireland already in some city wards.

You say it is a socialistic principle I am defending, and you think the rich ought not to be called on to help the poor beyond their own wishes. The socialistic principle is, let everybody be helped by the state. The co-operative principle is, help those who cannot help themselves. I hold that the children of the poor need help to obtain an education. The demand for education is in an inverse intensity to the need of it. When you give state aid to the high school, you are only taking the necessary steps to make safe and permanent the liberties of American citizenship. State aid to high schools is no more socialistic than state aid to military, naval, and agricultural schools. You have state universities; but I am not asking you to open colleges freely to everybody. I am not supposing that we are to open technical schools to everybody; but I should advocate opening them to every one who can pay a small tuition fee. There will very soon be an attack made on the industrial and technical and agricultural, and perhaps against military and naval schools, aided by Government, if we allow the thoughtless clamour against state aid to high schools to go unrebuked. If we permit a suspension of the activities of the high schools, very soon this liquid in the cup of our civilization will grow cloudy from top to bottom. A certain order of rich men believe in caste and do not like taxes for high schools. Already the whisper grows loud in the Southern States that the money of whites must not support high schools for black men. This is the opinion on the Gulf—not of a majority as yet, but of a powerful minority. "We must not give equal educational facilities to the blacks and whites"—that is the cry of a very powerful party in the South. That foam of aristocracy in the old slave states is at the top of the cup; the dregs of the Northern city populations are at the bottom; and the two are manipulated by this priestly yeast, shooting from one to the other. What I fear is the ultimate cloudiness of the whole cup, and such cloudiness that God's light cannot shoot through it and enlighten us when we need inner illumination.

Give me that kind of secondary instruction which our fathers planned for.

Give me that kind of primary instruction which we have had for an hundred years. Give me no text-books seamed through and through with sectarian partizanship.

Cotton Mather's bones lie yonder on Copp's Hill. If the Romanists were to dig them up and cast them into the sea, and found above the grave a cathedral, the nation would be roused. Jesuitical text-books used for the instruction of six millions of our population are a spade which digs up our father's bones and casts them forth to bleach under the winds of ridicule, and founds upon the spot where they lie the basis of a purely sectarian propagandism. Am I to be blamed for opening my lips here, when the whispers of this conspiracy fill all the hissing dark around me? Look into the corners, look beneath the surface of American civilization; and at the same time from afar keep your eyes upon the beacon of a united citizenship, and of that universal theocracy, the hope of founding which led, as a pillar of cloud and fire, our fathers through the wilderness of our early history.

The Lecture.

Near the grave of Lincoln a magnificent state house has lately been invaded by an army of mothers and daughters who brought with them a petition almost a mile in length, and which now hangs in festoons around the legislative chamber of Illinois. It contained the signatures of one hundred and ten thousand persons, who ask, not for the granting of the ballot to women in regard to the political multiplex and mäelstrom of party activity; not for municipal and town suffrage for women; and not even for a vote for her concerning the education of her children, although this has already been granted to her in New Hampshire, a conservative New England state. This petition is for a narrower right and a far more restricted opportunity. Its strength is in its moderation. It asks simply that, when local option in any town or city is to be exercised as to temperance laws, women of legal age, who fulfil other conditions required of male voters, may be allowed to express their opinion on the simple and not at all bewildering inquiry whether liquor shall be sold or not.

You say that we have already enough ignorant suffrage. You say that we have a sufficiently extensive tract of absenteeism at the polls and of unused ballots in every election. With John Bright, you are horrified at the carelessness of voters as to the use of their political powers. It may be that you secretly believe that the natural operation of universal suffrage, except in great cases, when all the voters come out, is to lift the scoundrel class to the summit of affairs. You think that I am about to make an insidious plea in favour of the driving of an entering wedge for woman's suffrage into the riven oak of American institutions, and that manhood suffrage has already shown itself to be a mischievous glut, that may tear that oak into splinters of such shape that they never can be hewn into fit building material for permanent political institutions. You are prejudiced against the position I am about to take this morning, because you suppose I

stand here to defend woman suffrage at large, or that I am to claim for women a right to vote in municipal and town affairs.

It is true that here and now I have no opposition to offer to woman's demand for the right to vote in city elections; but the absence of opposition must not be taken for entire acquiescence in even the bill that a majority in the Massachusetts Legislature, under the gilded dome yonder, has recommended as to municipal suffrage for women. As represented by the majority of her legislative committee, that lately held a hearing on the topic of the largest application of women's suffrage to political affairs, Massachusetts recommends a constitutional amendment admitting women not only to the right to vote, but to the right to hold office. Unless the men on that committee are absolutely insane in opening the whole door; unless they are to be sent to the lunatic asylum for swinging the gates before woman's suffrage open to the utmost, you must not think me utterly wild this morning for opening them hardly far enough to enable you to see that the gates are ajar.

Woman's suffrage is asked for by its friends, because, in their opinion, it is a natural right, a civil right, and for the benefit of society. It is on the latter ground only that the demand for woman's vote in questions as to temperance laws is made. This latter ground is by far the most defensible of the three positions.

Even with conservative men I claim a hearing on the ground of the comparative moderation and sobriety of my plea. I open the gate to woman's suffrage only so far as England has done. I open it only as far as Scotland has done. No; I do not open it as far. I open it less widely than England does; for she gives to tax-paying women the right to vote in municipal and town affairs. I am asking for less than that. But I am not criticizing England. I am not criticizing the majority of the Massachusetts committee. With his excellency, the governor of this honoured commonwealth, I believe that so many are in favour of a constitutional amendment permitting woman suffrage in its fullest range that the time has come when the opinion of the people at large ought to be asked as to the propriety of making such an amendment. You say it is an entering wedge to ask the people what they think about that amendment. Well, you believe in the people. Do you not? You are willing, many of you, although you are opposed to woman's suffrage at large, to have the question go to the people on that amendment. I am sure I am willing to have that done, and I am meditating as to which way I will vote. If the narrower proposition came before me to give women the right to vote in municipal and town affairs, I should have far less hesitation than in regard to this wide, large measure.

On the vexed theme of female suffrage you know that my principle is that women's rights should come by evolution, and not by revolution. I want a little of women's rights tried first; and then, if the experience is bad, we can go back on our track. If the experience is good, we can go forward. Let us be conservative; but let us not be unimprovable. I repel indignantly the insinuations of any who think that I am making a plea for women's temperance vote with the hope of advancing women's suffrage at large. If the nose of the camel enters the tent, his whole body will soon be in it, you say. Well; but there is a tiger in the tent already, and if the camel were to displace him we could spare a considerable amount of room. What I want is not an entering wedge, but an appeal to experience. Divide the question as to woman's suffrage. There are many forms in which woman's ballot is asked for: as, for example, on all questions as to which men vote; or on municipal and town questions only; or on educational questions only; or on temperance questions only. Wyoming, with results which I believe to be good, has tried the first; New Hampshire has tried the third of these methods; Illinois is asked to try the last. Massachusetts, without a constitutional amendment, might grant municipal suffrage to women. Judge Sewall says this can be done. We now require the same qualifications for town and city voters, on the one hand, and for voters for state officers, on the other hand; but the truth is that we had one hundred and thirty-two years of experience in this commonwealth of a different set of qualifications on those two points. For that extent of time, ending in the year 1822, the qualifications of town voters were always more liberal than those required by the charter and the constitution for the former class. The qualifications for voters for state and town officers are now exactly the same. But now, as from the beginning, the former are regulated by the constitution and the latter by the general court.*

If the change does not require an amendment to the constitution, municipal suffrage for women will be a very safe experiment. We can recede from it. If municipal suffrage for women were tried, we should have the evils of women's suffrage exhibited on a small scale; and then the opponents of the measure will be enabled to appeal to the record of experience against the enlargement of suffrage for women. If, on the other hand, this measure should act the other way, then God forbid that I should go against the law of the survival of the fittest! Where are the opponents of municipal suffrage for women, that they are not willing to try this experiment? They

* See Judge Sewall's argument, *Woman's Journal*, February, 1878.

say that families would be broken up, and that woman would cease to be loveable if she were to go to the polls. Well, woman has gone to the polls in Great Britain, quite a while, and I have to announce here this morning that British families are not yet broken up. Woman has had the right for years, as a tax-payer of Great Britain, to vote in city and town elections; and the British fireside is yet ablaze. The granting of municipal suffrage in Great Britain to woman has not been accountable for any great amount of mischief. In Scotland woman has had certain rights as to educational laws; and we do not hear that she has been clamouring there for impossibilities. I believe that experience of England has substantially justified the giving of the ballot to tax-paying women who are not represented by any head of a family. Under English law a woman who is married cannot be a tax-payer, for her property belongs to her husband. The gift of the vote to women in England, when she is a tax-payer, is, therefore, somewhat in the nature of a gift to the head of a family as the representative of property. Even if you are not willing to introduce a property qualification in such form as England has adopted, still the substantial justice of the matter is the same on this as on the other side of the sea.

I am perfectly aware how complicated the question as to a property qualification for voting is in woman's case. Woman suffragists themselves are not agreed as to the matter. Here are certain rich ladies, who pay high taxes. You give them a vote, but perhaps they are no more qualified to use the suffrage intelligently than the school-mistress who can hardly pay a poll-tax. The question is whether we should not be introducing into society class distinctions and class animosities, if we were to adopt municipal suffrage for women on the basis of property qualifications not required of men. I am more than a little shy about such an innovation.

Municipal suffrage for women is saddled with a great number of difficulties that do not belong to this topic of temperance suffrage. The Illinois movement makes no appeals to class animosity.

Here is the language of the famous petition:—

"FOR GOD AND HOME, AND NATIVE LAND, HOME-PROTECTION PETITION.

"ILLINOIS WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.

"To the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Illinois:

"Whereas, in these years of temperance work the argument of defeat in our contest with the saloons has taught us that our effects are merely palliative of a disease in the body politic, which can

never be cured until law and moral suasion go hand and hand in our beloved State; and

"Whereas, the instincts of self-protection and of apprehension for the safety of her children, her tempted loved ones, and her home, render woman the natural enemy of the saloons: Therefore, your petitioners, men and women of the State of Illinois, having at heart the protection of our homes from their worst enemy, the legalized traffic in strong drink, do hereby earnestly pray your honourable body that by suitable legislation it may be provided that in the State of Illinois the question of licensing, at any time, in any locality, the sale of any and all intoxicating drinks (including wine and beer), shall be submitted to and determined by ballot, in which women of lawful age shall be privileged to take part, in the same manner as men, when voting on the question of licence."

The essential parts of the bill the Illinois Legislature is asked to pass are these:—

"No licences for the sale of spirituous or intoxicating liquors shall be granted, in any city or town, unless such city or town shall vote to authorize the issue thereof each year, as hereinafter provided. Provided, however, that licences may be issued, in the discretion of the municipal authorities, to druggists and apothecaries to sell for medicinal, mechanical, and chemical purposes only.

"The vote shall be by ballot; and ballots shall be 'Yes' or 'No,' in answer to the question: 'Shall the mayor and alderman (or select-men) be authorized to grant licences for the sale of intoxicating liquors in this city (or town)?'

"Any woman possessing the other qualifications for voting now established by law may apply to one of the assessors of the city or town in which she has residence to be assessed for a poll tax, and shall be so assessed; and upon payment thereof she may apply to the proper board of registration of voters in such city or town, not later than the Saturday preceding such day of voting, and it shall be the duty of such board, upon being satisfied that she possesses the other qualifications required of voters, to place her name on the voting list for use at such meetings; and she shall continue to be so assessed each year, until she shall otherwise request in writing: and so long as such qualifications continue to exist she shall have at all meetings held under this act all the rights of a legally qualified voter.

"All licences granted under the provisions of this act, and of the act of which this is an amendment, shall contain, in addition to the name of the licensee, the name of the owner of the premises upon which the business is to be carried on. The clerk of each city and town shall keep a complete record of all licensees, with their bonds-men, and of the owners of the premises upon which the business is to be carried on in each case, which record shall at all times be open to public inspection."

There are five States in our nation that are being brought up

abreast of the line of this proposed legislation, and Massachusetts is one of the number. Legislatures have usually given a respectful hearing in favour of woman suffrage on the temperance vote. What is more significant, the advocates of this moderate measure have had a good hearing among their critics. I suppose that women in general are not in favour of the large application of woman suffrage—or, at least, not yet; but I have information from North, South, East, and West that this modified measure in regard to temperance laws has their general support. All the names on record in favour of the wider measure are, of course, in favour of the narrower, and every defender of the former is a defender of the latter. The less is included in the greater.

In Chicago two boys, one seven years and one eleven years of age, were made so drunk in a saloon that they rolled in the gutter. The widowed mother of another mere boy went to the spot of infamy and drew her child out upon the sidewalk and endeavoured to walk home with him; but was herself thrust into the street. The saloon-keeper came out, tore the boy from the widow's embrace, and pushed him back into his den; and she went home, weeping over the ruin of her son. A citizen's league took up the widow's cause, and succeeded in punishing the brutish proprietor and causing the boy to reform. An investigation has shown that more than a quarter of all the arrests in Chicago and of the commitments to the House of Correction are of minors, twenty years old and under. The statement is published that 30,000 boys and girls patronize the city's drinking places, 1,000 of which were largely supported by their patronage. The activity of the friends of temperance diminished the juvenile arrests for 1878 by 2,000, as compared with 1877; but the ruin of the young progresses yet at a fearful rate. What Miss Frances Willard wants, and what the women of Illinois who are petitioning the legislature at Lincoln's grave ask for, is that this widow may see the face of a just judge. The petition is that the widow who has her family to protect may herself be protected by the arm of her brethren in the state, and that she may find the saloon-keeper put under a public ban, not only by the votes of the careless dwellers in the slums, and not only by the legislation of males; but by the swift thunderbolts of her own and of her sisters' indignation poured out upon those places where the family is undermined. That is what home protection means in the concrete. That widow and these children mean not Chicago only; but New York, and Cincinnati, and Boston, and every city and town in the nation. This widow and her children represent American civilization, and the question is whether you will give the widow power to make law on this one point. Say she is half daft politically; say

no woman can reason; say all that you please in support of the nonsense that is often uttered against woman's rights; you can but admit there is great natural justice in allowing the issue, in a town where the question arises whether liquor is to be sold or not, to be determined by the counting of this widow's vote as well as by the vote of that saloon-keeper.

Why should women be allowed to vote in cases of local option as to temperance laws?

1. It is more difficult for a woman to obtain a livelihood alone than for a man to do so; and so she has a deeper interest than man in the home.

A colossal fact that and one that will reward the attention of lawmakers. It is harder for a woman to start in a trade than for a man to do so. A man expects to continue his trade independently. A woman expects to be married, and to unite her business with that of her husband. For a thousand other reasons the woman left alone is worse off than the man; and so her feeling as to home is usually more intense than man's, to say nothing of her native endowments. We are told by the physiologists that God has given women home attachments such as men rarely possess, and that on the average her heart is deeper and more intense than man's concerning the protection of children and all the interests of the family fireside.

2. Woman's love of home is the natural antagonist of the enemies of the home, and among these perhaps the most mischievous is intemperance.

3. Woman is less intemperate than man, and so could be trusted to give a purer vote on temperance laws.

That is a large fact, although I cannot state it without apparent discourtesy to the sex. In the froth of society there are sparkles of strong drink—God quench them!—and in the dregs we have the rills of intemperance, mixing the mire; but in the middle class of society, which makes up the great body of the people, woman is pure. She is there lifted utterly out of this slough in which man staggers and falls prostrate out of every rank in life. As far less intemperate than man, woman is more likely to have a balanced, sound mind on this theme, take her all in all.

4. Woman is less complicated with party intrigue and political ambition, with desire for office and with business at large; and so would be more free than men to give a vote on the merits of the case.

5. A temperance vote by women would be a test by which the theory of woman's suffrage could be tried on a restricted scale without danger.

6. It would not be an entering wedge, but only an appeal to experience; and the latter, as it should reveal good or bad tendencies in the theory, would decide the result.

7. Rum-sellers oppose the temperance vote of women. I suppose that nothing has ever stirred the rum-sellers of Chicago, St. Louis, and Cincinnati quite so much as this movement to give the temperance vote to women. If you will show me what rum-sellers do not want, I will show you what I want.

8. The temperance vote is asked for by women in overwhelming numbers, most of whom are not female suffragists.

9. Such a change as woman's temperance ballot asks for is not connected with the high theories as to natural rights to suffrage, nor as to property qualifications.

10. Under English law, women paying taxes can vote in municipal and town elections; and this wider privilege, which has worked well, includes the narrower one of women's temperance vote.

11. In questions where the decision is so easy as that between licence and no licence, woman's vote would not often be unintelligent, and so would not add to the mass of the ignorant suffrage.

12. In questions so important to the home as those relating to temperance laws, woman's vote would not often be unused, and so would not add essentially to the dangers of absenteeism at the polls and of unexercised suffrage.

Pardon me if I say that, when on the Berkshire Hills a law concerning temperance is enforced by the legislature on Beacon Hill, there may be some feeling in the sunset that there has been a conspiracy in the sunrise, and that a law so passed may not be, perhaps, quite according to justice. But if, in local option, each town votes and woman votes, how tremendously do you strengthen the local sentiment in favour of the execution of the law! When woman is allowed to vote on the simple question of licence or no licence, and votes against it, how subtly do you appeal to the colossal force of chivalry; how do you appeal to the church; how do you appeal to the degraded saloon-keeper himself; how do you appeal, in the name of suffering homes and of children on the verge of ruin, for the stern execution of a law adopted under such holy sanction! I am a prohibitionist.

In spite of the figures that have been published to show the contrary, I am convinced that under the licence law of this commonwealth more cases were carried into the waste-basket than there were under the prohibitory law itself, which you said could not be executed, and, therefore, ought to be repealed. The licence law has not been as well executed as the prohibitory law was in this common-

wealth.* If you want public sentiment to execute temperance laws, give woman a vote on temperance. If you want public sentiment to execute educational laws, give woman a vote on education. If the evolution proceeding from these two changes is good, then God will bring the revolution; and, if it is bad, we shall return to the path of the fathers. At any rate, give us the reading test; let us shut out all from suffrage who, born after 1900, will not learn to read and write and are warned in advance. If you will take away all the evils of ignorant suffrage among men, free society will not be ruined by any evils that may spring from the educational and temperance vote in the hands of women.

Woman's temperance vote is so likely to save the home and wreck the saloon that it is worth full trial. Woman's love of home is the natural enemy of the saloon; and I say, God give free course to woman's demand for the temperance ballot, until, under home protection, the saloon is throttled by woman's superb attachment to her children.

I am not, I hope, a man of one idea. We part to-day from the subject of Socialism; but you know that, in discussing this disease, I have not confined myself to the eulogy of any one antidote. Among the remedies on which I have insisted are education for factory children, co-operation, industrial partnerships, labour bureaus, building societies, model lodging houses, Sabbath laws, anti-tramp laws, arbitration boards, natural as distinct from starvation wages, temperance legislation, and woman's vote in regard to temperance laws. More than upon anything else, I have insisted on church activity as a remedy for the perils of universal suffrage; and if, as we now separate, to see each other's faces perhaps no more for ever, I could once for all picture my thoughts as to America and the vexed world with sufficient vividness to impress the memory permanently, I would say, reverently and with unflinching conviction, that the short road out of all political disease, and the only road, is the one which begins at Mount Sinai, and passes through the valley of Gethsemane, and ascends the slope of Calvary, and persuades the bruised and staggering ages to throw down their burden before the Cross.

---

* See W. F. Spaulding's argument before the legislative committee at this winter's hearing on licence.

REV. PHILLIPS BROOKS.

Since Robertson of Brighton died, no English or American preacher has more thoroughly interpreted the Spirit and purpose of our modern life than Phillips Brooks."—"N. Y. Times."

SERMONS. Preached in Trinity Church, Boston, U.S., by Rev. PHILLIPS BROOKS. New edition, crown 8vo, cloth, 4s. 6d., post free.

The reader of these Sermons is borne along by a strong and rapid current of thought. He finds no time to resist the strain if he would. In general he has no strength to resist it; but he is carried forward by the resistless torrent of the preacher's thoughts. He is not indebted for his opinions or his methods of defending them—an original author is a profitable one.—"Bibliotheca Sacra."

"What is the secret of the success of this volume? It is, perhaps, hard to explain it fully. There is an indefinable charm about these sermons, like the *aureola* around the pictured heads of the old saints. Whence proceeding, it is impossible to tell; very real, nevertheless. Still, there are certain recognisable elements of power which secure the substance, if they do not explain the fineness, of the impression made. Wit enough to see the want of them, and grace enough to strive for them, will enable every preacher to make them in some degree his own.

"To begin with, there is an immense power of *personality* in these discourses. Not egotism; there is not a particle of that; but there seems to be a man standing behind the printed page—a living voice in every sentence. These sermons are the utterances of life, not abstractions. They are truth incarnate, the Word made flesh, doctrines tested and transmuted into experience. The preacher is in 'dead earnest,' because he knows whereof he affirms, and that knowledge gives the push and pungency of personal life to the statements in which he formulates, and the illustrations with which he illuminates the simplest and the sublimest thought.

"An equally notable quality of these sermons is their *humanness*—the recognition of the common manhood of the preacher and the hearer, and a sympathy broad enough to reach out the hand to a man in any condition of life. Tenderness for the sinner is coupled with the reprobation of his sin. These discourses have none of the unconscious Pharisaism that sometimes mars pulpit utterances. There is authority in their tone, but no assumption of superiority. The preacher does not speak *ex cathedra*, but on the level and by the right of common brotherhood. He recognises the snarl of circumstances in which so many lives are tangled, and exercises the generosity of the strong towards the weak. There is no feebleness of moral estimate, no condoning of sin, and yet the rebukes are the 'wounds of a friend,' not the stroke of the scourge. This is in part due to the preacher's profound knowledge of human nature. Evidently he is familiar with the feelings of men in the most opposite moral conditions, and 'nothing human he counts foreign to himself.' All preachers may well covet this element of power. In every congregation there are sick, sad, suffering hearts; and the beat of another and stronger heart against theirs, and for them, is like the stroke of Moses's rod upon the rock, followed by the rush of wholesome, glad response.

"Moreover, there is in these sermons a hearty *robustness* of thought. The preacher really believes in God and righteousness, and so utters his convictions manfashion. To him the domain of religion is not girdled with the horizon of Shadowland. He has no liking for saints who are 'feeble, nerveless creatures, silly and effeminate, the mere soft padding of the universe.' In this *dilettante* age, when so many men touch religious truth with their finger-tips, if at all, it is invigorating to see a man in foremost place strike the colour of certainty through his utterances. Limpness of conviction is fatal to pulpit power. It is the man who *knows*, and makes us feel that he knows, who gets our hearing, And this, too, is the secret of that courage that presses the universal adaptation of the truth, not leaving untouched the weakness of the high, while it scathes the vices of the low. The Great White Throne must shadow the palace and the attic alike, and all be taught that they have sinned against the goodness, and need the saving grace of God."—Rev. E. S. ATWOOD, in "Boston Congregationalist."

"Phillips Brooks is unquestionably one of the best preachers in America. His

'Lectures on Preaching were the freshest, wisest, most valuable contribution to the subject that has appeared for a great while. These Sermons are the exemplification of those Lectures. The 'personal element' in his preaching is never lost sight of. The preacher is a person speaking to persons about a Person in whom we all live and move and have our being. In his view, the Gospel he preaches is totally and intensely personal. The Gospel is full of truths, is infinitely instructive because of the ideas which it contains; and these truths, and ideas, fascinate the preacher's mind with an immeasurable sweetness and power, and still it is the *uses* of truth that engages his soul and makes the preaching of Christ's Gospel the absorbing passion of his life. 'By this Gospel we look for salvation. It is a Gospel to be used, to be believed in, and to be lived by; not merely to be kept and admired and discussed and explained. Only we are always to remember that the truth is given to us, not to be lectured on, but to be lived by; as the telescope is precious because it can sweep the sky and separate the star-dust into recognisable worlds; and not because its parts are beautifully adjusted and its whole construction is a miracle of mechanism.'

"In respect to the choice of words, Mr. Brooks' style is simplicity itself,—John Bunyan's not more so. His illustrations are numerous, but we should say, sufficient rather than abundant. His sentences are short or long, as best suits the thought. His sermons are at once 'textual' and 'topical.' As for his introductions, he spends no time in travelling round a circle to find a starting-point, or in running back and then forward to get headway. He simply takes his stand at his subject, and starts from where he is; does not get lost on the way, and knows when he gets to his destination. He is evangelical, profoundly so; he is orthodox, and he is in a very true way liberal. We had marked a number of passages for quotation, but have not room here. It is a singularly rich volume, full of the best truths, exceedingly well set forth."—"The Advance."

"The truth which the author presents is that which *he* has found for himself; it is that which *he* holds with a most tenacious grasp, and it is that which *he* believes to be of greatest importance to his hearers. There is, therefore, very little of the conventional in these sermons. Their author does not trouble himself much, if at all, about models, and he is not concerned to keep up theological modes of speech. He goes into his own subject at his own angle, treats it in his own way, and speaks of spiritual realities in ordinary phraseology, which is not the echo of a former meaning, but is instinct with the life and activity of to-day. There is a wonderful union of calm breadth of view with rushing and resistless earnestness in these sermons. . . . . They are, however, no ordinary sermons; for every page contains evidence of careful research and meditation, wide culture, and accurate scholarship and a breadth of view and philosophic comprehension of truth not often met with in Sermon literature. There is no pedantry of learning, no misty speculations, no cumbersome phraseology, but a simple, chaste exposition of Evangelical Truth, without a trace of narrowness or a touch of bigotry."—"The Primitive Methodist."

"It is a long time since we read sermons of so much interest in many ways as those by Mr. Phillips Brooks. They are very distinct in their style and character from the sermons of Robertson, of Brighton; but we confess again and again, as we have quietly perused them—in circumstances which have been more than usually helpful to an apprehension of their merits—that we have thought of that distinguished preacher. We had not read more than one sermon before we were quite sure that Mr. Brooks had much to say upon whatever subject he undertook to enlighten us; indeed, we were sure of receiving considerable instruction in respect to any text which might form the topic of his discourses; and as sermon after sermon passed under our eye, the feeling to which the perusal of the first had given rise, was amply justified. He evidently sets out with the determination to comprehend as far as possible the theme which is placed under his notice, and he does not give up his work until he has something to say which may prove helpful, not only towards the devout impression, but for the intelligent instruction of his hearers. Many of our clerical readers will know the pleasure—earnest zest we had rather call it—with which they begin the perusal of a sermon from a preacher who is sure to help them to understand the subject as they did not understand it before. This pleasurable zest is certain to be the portion of those who will make the acquaintance of Mr. Phillips Brooks. He is a Churchman, as we have seen, but a Churchman of the best order. He has the fervour of an Evangelical, the manly intelligence of a Broad Churchman, and the refined taste of a High Churchman. The evident pride which he cherishes in respect to the ancient tradition of his Church, the reverence which he pays to her

services, and the importance which he attaches to her devout and noble associations, help to deepen the impression made in many of these sermons. We are charmed with the singular ability which he displays in dealing with difficult themes; for while like Robertson, he never closes his eye to whatever difficulties are connected with a theme, he also grapples with them in a manful and noble way. We cannot do better, perhaps, by way of indicating Mr. Brooks' style, than by quoting one or two passages from the sermon on 'Keeping the Faith.' The first passage deals with Mr. Brooks's conception of the first requisite of the faith which it is possible for a man to keep.

"'THE NECESSITY FOR A BROAD CREED.

"'In the first place, it must be a creed broad enough to allow the man to grow within it, to contain and to supply his ever-developing mind and character. It will not be a creed burdened with many details. It will consist of large truths and principles, capable of ever-varying applications to ever-varying life. So only can it be clear, strong, positive, and yet leave the soul free to grow within it—nay, feed the soul richly and minister to its growth. The men of narrowest ideas are the most changeable or the most obstinate of men. If their minds are active they are changeable, always shifting one narrow position for another. If their minds are sluggish they are obstinate, doggedly clinging to the splinter of truth on which they have been wrecked. But the true Christian believer says with David, "Thou hast set my feet in a large room," and in the large truth where his Lord has put him he abides, finding abundant space to live his life and grow his growth.'

"The second characteristic of the faith which can be kept, will be, Mr. Brooks says, its evidence, its proved truth; and here he distinguishes finally between

"'MERE OPINIONS AND EARNEST BELIEFS.

"'The reason why a great many people seem to be always changing their faith is that they never really have any faith. They have, indeed, what they call a faith, and are often very positive about it. They have gathered together a number of opinions and fancies, often very ill-considered, which they say that they believe, using the deep and sacred Word for a very superficial and frivolous action of their wills. They no more have a faith than the city vagrant has a home who sleeps upon a different doorstep every night. And yet he does sleep somewhere every night; and so these wanderers among the creeds at each given moment are believing something, although that something is for ever altering. We do not properly believe what we only think. A thousand speculations come into our heads, and our minds dwell upon them, which are not, therefore, to be put into our creed, however plausible they seem. Our creed, our *credo*, anything which we call by such a sacred name, is not what we have thought, but what our Lord has told us. The true creed must come down from above, and not out from within. Have your opinions always, but do not bind yourself to them. Call your opinions your creed, and you will change it every week. Make your creed simply and broadly out of the revelations of God, and you may keep it to the end. This is the difference between the hundreds of long-detailed confessions of many different sects, overloaded with the minute speculations of good men, which take in and dismiss their leaders like the nightly lodgers of an Eastern caravansary, and the short Scriptural creed of the Church universal, into which souls come seeking rest and strength, and live in it as in a home, and go no more out for ever.'

"Preachers will do themselves invaluable service if they will make the acquaintance of this volume, not simply for the purpose of furnishing them with pulpit materials, but in order to gain the benefits of as fine an example of noble Christian instruction as we can present for their emulation."—"Literary World."

"There is not one Discourse in this Volume which is not distinguished by some of the highest qualities of this Christian preacher. He has thoughtfulness, breadth, culture, and fine spiritual sympathies. There are persons in Boston who say that Mr. Brooks is the greatest of living preachers."—"The Nonconformist."

"In style Mr. Brooks forcibly reminds us of the man, who, more than any other, has influenced the thoughtful preaching of the age: we allude to Fred. Robertson, of Brighton. As we read the second sermon of this Volume, "The Withheld Completions of Life" (John xiii. 37), we could scarcely persuade ourselves that it was not something hitherto unpublished of Robertson that we had before us. Yet it is evident that Mr. Brooks is no imitator. Every page glows with a fervour that has its rise in the preacher's own soul; and if we may judge by the effects produced by careful

reading, these discourses must have exerted a most healthful stimulus upon the mind and hearts of those who heard them."—"The Preacher."

BROOKS'S (Rev PHILLIPS) *LECTURES ON PREACHING.* Delivered before the Divinity School of Yale College, in January and February, 1877. 4th Edition, enlarged. 8vo, cloth, 4s. 6d.

"These are admirable lectures. Nothing better of the kind, nothing more really helpful, has ever appeared. No candidate for Holy Orders, no theological student, no clergyman can read the first three lectures without being impressed with the solemnity and the blessedness of the preacher's work."—"Churchman."

"We do not hesitate to say that they are of more practical value than any work of the sort we have ever seen. . . . . It is a book to be read for the feeling it awakens, but feeling so lofty that it is one with wisdom and truth."—"Literary World."

"It is spiritually quickening, and no preacher can read it without having his ideas of preaching enlarged, and his desire for better attainment in his work increased."—"Illustrated Christian Weekly."

"Every page of the volume is replete with practical wisdom and sound common sense, and invites the careful reading of any minister who desires to avail himself of the results of the study of a mind keenly alive to the demands of the age, and the needs and influence of the ministry."—"The Appeal."

"No man, lay or clerical, who likes bright thoughts and clear artistic expression, can afford to neglect this volume."—"New York Sun."

"Will be found as useful to young laymen as to young clergymen. Their counsels, with certain changes in detail, are as applicable to the pursuits of business life, in whatever vocation, as to the duties of the pastorate. It is a book we commend to every young man and woman desirous of efficient work and noble living."

"One prominent characteristic of these lectures is their originality. We always feel a pity for a preacher who discourses on the worth of the soul. We tremble when he announces the text: 'What shall it profit a man,' etc. (Mark viii. 36). Yet on pp. 255-281 of this volume we find an entire lecture on the 'Value of the Human Soul;' and the lecture, avoiding commonplaces, is full of rich suggestion. Many passages in the volume are beautiful, and many are of solid worth. Trains of thought like the following must be useful in these days of superficial discourse.

"It is a great mistake to imagine that a preacher augments his popularity by diluting his thought; that his great danger lies in preaching over the heads of his people; that he must habitually preach *down* to his hearers. 'Generally it is not the character of the ammunition, but the fault of the aim, that makes the missing shot. . . . . The people will get the heart out of the most thorough and thoughtful sermon, if only it really is a sermon. Even subtilty of thought, the tracing of intricate relations of ideas, it is remarkable how men of no subtle thought will follow it, if it is really preached. But the subtilty which has delighted in itself, which has spun itself fine for its own pleasure in seeing how fine it could be spun, vexes and throws them off; and they are right. Never be afraid to call upon your people to follow your best thought, if only it is really trying to lead them somewhere. The confidence of the minister in the people is at the bottom of every confidence of the people in the minister' (p. 113).

"Discourses which are thoughtful will be doctrinal. The truths of the gospel may be presented with the ultimate purpose of securing an intellectual belief in them; but then they are not *preached*. In order to be *really* preached they must be held forth for the purpose of influencing the life. 'Much of our preaching is like delivering lectures upon medicine to sick people. The lecture is true. The lecture is interesting. Nay, the truth of the lecture is important; and if the sick man could learn the truth of the lecture he would be a better patient; he would take his medicine more responsibly and regulate his diet more intelligently. But still the fact remains that the lecture is not medicine, and that to give the medicine, not to deliver the lecture, is the preacher's duty' (p. 126). 'The truth is, no preaching ever had any strong power that was not the preaching of doctrine. The preachers that have moved and held men have always preached doctrine. No exhortation to a good life that does not put behind it some truth as deep as eternity can seize and hold the conscience. Preach doctrine, preach all the doctrine that you know, and learn for ever more and more; but preach it always not that men may believe it, but that men may be saved by believing it' (p. 129)."

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

BT15 .C64
Cook, Joseph, 1838-1901.
Monday lectures in Tremont Hall, Boston

BT
15
C64

Cook, Joseph, 1838-1901.
Monday lectures in Tremont Hall, Boston, U.S. : fourth series / by Joseph Cook. -- London : R. D. Dickinson, 1879.
iv, 278p. ; 23cm.

At head of title: Boston Monday lectures, U.S.
Bibliographical footnotes.

1. Theology--Addresses, essays, lectures. I. Title. II. Cook, Joseph, 1838-1901. Boston Monday lectures.

CCSC/mmb

A25073